# Negative

## Notes

The cards under the header Will Pass – Obama Push are also PC key warrants

The first card under PC Key – is an AT TPP only in post election – it indicates post election passage requires PC

## 1nc

#### Obama’s mounted a full court press – China trade concerns and resolving Congressional concerns vis-à-vis allies’ commitment clear the way for passage

Memoli and Parsons 5/25

Michael A. Memoli, Political Reporter in the Tribune Washington bureau and Christi Parsons, White House correspondent, “Obama races to cement the big Pacific Rim trade deal that all his potential successors oppose” http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-fi-obama-vietnam-trade-20160525-snap-story.html

President Obama is racing against the clock to cement a massive Pacific Rim trade deal that all of his potential successors oppose, with his administration eyeing a looming fight on Capitol Hill while starting to implement as much of the complicated pact as it can. The effort begins in Vietnam, where Obama spent the last three days touting the merits of the 12-nation Trans Pacific Partnership, which would link 40% of the global economy, and reassuring Vietnamese leaders key to the deal that Congress will ultimately overcome the thorny politics of trade and ratify the agreement. “Nothing is easy in Washington these days,” Obama assured participants at a round table discussion with business leaders Tuesday in Ho Chi Minh City, the heart of what is one of Asia’s fastest-growing economies. “But despite sometimes the lack of cooperation with Congress, I seem to be able to get a lot of things done anyway.” Ordinarily, a presidential administration would wait until Congress ratifies a trade agreement before putting it into force with member nations. But with just eight months left in office and presidential candidates Hillary Clinton, Donald Trump and Bernie Sanders all against the deal, Obama and his advisors appear to have concluded that they must speed up that lengthy process to preserve the trade pact. “In this case, we’ve decided to accelerate that,” U.S. Trade Representative Mike Froman said. “In consultation with Congress, we are already working with the countries in the region on the various steps that they’ll need to take to bring themselves into compliance with TPP." He cited Vietnam as an example, saying U.S. officials have traveled to the country over the last couple of months to discuss its obligations under the deal. TPP would create the world's largest free trade zone, deepening economic ties between the U.S. and fellow signatories including Canada, Mexico, Japan, Australia and Singapore. The administration says it would eventually eliminate more than 18,000 tariffs that other nations impose on American imports such as textiles, chemical goods, fruit, beef and wine and beer. Last week’s release of an independent report analyzing TPP’s economic impact on the U.S. cleared the way for Congress to begin formal consideration of the final agreement. The White House says it is in regular consultation with congressional leaders about the best legislative strategy going forward, and wants to see it approved as soon as possible. But both Democratic and Republican leaders in Congress have said they are reluctant to bring the measure to a vote during the heat of a presidential campaign in which the three remaining presidential contenders are avowed opponents. The White House says neither the U.S. nor the other signatories are willing to reopen the agreement to make changes that might bring additional political support here. But by beginning the implementation work with countries like Vietnam, they can take steps that could help make wary members of Congress more confident that U.S. partners will abide by the terms of the agreement reached last fall. Some critics in Congress were particularly skeptical of what they saw as overly generous terms for Vietnam to comply with new labor and environmental standards of the deal, as well as an extended timeline that it was granted to begin setting up independent trade unions. And a report from the International Trade Commission released last week, which found that the deal would boost U.S. annual real income by only a modest $57.3 billion by 2032, gave ammunition to opponents in organized labor who said its potential impact on U.S. manufacturing was too severe. "[The] report is so damaging that any reasonable observer would have to wonder why the administration or Congress would spend even one more day trying to turn this disastrous proposal into a reality," AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka said. The administration’s ability to continue addressing lawmakers' concerns will be key to the timing of any vote, said House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Kevin Brady (R-Texas), who supports what he calls an “imperfect” agreement. “We cannot move forward until the administration has addressed member concerns on key aspects of the agreement,” he said, demanding reassurance from the White House that trade partners comply with the deal and that it will benefit the U.S. To win support in Congress, the Obama administration is making a familiar case that boils down to one question: What will China do? During its full-court press on Capitol Hill to secure passage of a key preliminary measure, administration officials found that raising the specter of China writing the rules for international trade was among their most successful arguments. Their case goes like this: The pact as written raises standards in places where the U.S. already does significant business, while dropping tariffs that inhibit the sale of U.S. goods in those countries. And if the U.S. were to back away, China would likely swoop into the void and forge its own accord, potentially expanding its influence while diminishing the United States'. Vietnam’s burgeoning middle class is a fertile market for U.S. goods, particularly for machinery and automotive exports. On Monday, Obama was on hand as U.S. firms including Boeing and GE signed commercial deals worth $16 billion in Vietnam. In an address to the Vietnamese people, Obama said he strongly supported the deal so that “you'll also be able to buy more of our goods, ‘made in America.’” Without mentioning China by name, he alluded to the pact's “important strategic benefits,” saying it would allow Vietnam to “be less dependent on any one trading partner and enjoy broader ties with more partners, including the United States.” “So we now have to get it done — for the sake of our economic prosperity and our national security,” he said. Obama's argument makes use of the political climate, pitting Donald Trump's harsh criticism about China against Trump's nationalist and anti-trade rhetoric, an odd political dance but one that congressional supporters of the deal have also embraced. “You hear a lot of the rhetoric from the presidential candidates, that they want to create 'Fortress America,' they want to build walls,” said Rep. Ron Kind of Wisconsin, leader of a bloc of the trade pact’s Democratic supporters in Congress. “We can be at the table, shaping the rules of globalization or it will be done to us. And that’s really the decision we face.” The most optimistic timeline in Congress appears to be for the deal to come to a vote in the lame duck session. Obama predicted recently lawmakers might vote after at least the primary election season had ended. Not so fast, warned one Democratic leader. “He has a more optimistic view of the [deal’s] chances than I do at the moment,” said Sen. Richard J. Durbin of Illinois, the minority whip, adding that the agreement “would have a difficult time passing the Senate” now. “Anything can happen” in the lame-duck session after the November election, Durbin said. “But when I think of how many issues are being saved for the lame duck, you’re putting a lot of burden on those frail wings.” Administration officials are heartened, though, by the fact that Democrats in particular who have supported the TPP so far have not suffered political consequences, despite a vow by labor groups last year to challenge them in primaries. Ten of the 28 Democrats who voted to support the preliminary “fast-track” legislation in June have already won primaries, all by significant margins or without any opposition at all. More than half of the remaining Democrats face no opposition in primaries to come.

#### INSERT LINK

#### Early-game PC is key

Beckmann 10 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 138)

Given postwar presidents' extensive lobbying investments, the rest of the chapter examines their impact on key roll-call votes. With simultaneous testing of the earlygame factors that affect which bills experience key votes alongside the endgame factors that determine the winner, the results affirm that presidents' involvement does dramatically increase their chances of prevailing in key votes. However, the essence of this influence looks different than is often assumed. Rather than turning on their influence in the legislative endgame, presidents' success in key votes is rooted primarily in the earlygame. Again, this does not mean that the legislative endgame is unimportant or that presidents' vote-centered lobbying is irrelevant but rather underscores the fact that its impact typically works indirectly by affecting the bargaining that transpires before bills even reach the floor. This same pattern holds true in both chambers.

#### TPP– they’re key to sustaining the global trade order

Suominen, Adjunct Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 8-4-14 (Kati, Adjunct Professor at the UCLA Anderson School of Management, “Coming Apart: WTO fiasco highlights urgency for the U.S. to lead the global trading system)

India’s torpedoing last week the WTO’s trade facilitation agreement, struck at the last minute between the United States and India in the December 2013 WTO Ministerial in Bali, is a death blow to the world body and adds to growing disarray in the global trading system. Two threats are emerging. The first is disintegration of the trading system. The core of the system until the mid-1990s, the WTO is utterly dysfunctional: deals require unanimity among 160 members, making any cantankerous player like India a veto. Aligning interests has been impossible, turning all action in global trade policymaking to free trade agreements (FTAs), first kicked off by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. By now, 400 FTAs are in place or under negotiation. FTAs have been good cholesterol for trade, but the overlapping deals and rules also complicate life for U.S. companies doing global business. One single deal among all countries would be much preferable to the “spaghetti bowl” of FTAs, but it is but a pie in the sky. So is deeper liberalization by protectionist countries like India. The U.S.-led talks for “mega-regional” agreements with Europe and Asia-Pacific nations, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), are the best solution yet to these problems. They free trade and create uniform rules among countries making up two-thirds of the world economy. Incidentally, they would create a million jobs in America. Yet both hang in balance thanks to inaction on Capitol Hill to pass the Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), the key piece of legislation for approving the mega-deals, now stuck in a bitter political fight as several Democrats and Tea Party line up in opposition. TPA is key for the Obama administration to conclude TPP and TTIP talks: Europeans and Asians are unwilling to negotiate the thorniest topics before they know TPA is in place to constrain U.S. Congress to voting up or down on these deals, rather than amending freshly negotiated texts. The second threat in world trade is the absence of common rules of the game for the 21st century global digital economy. As 3D printing, Internet of Things, and cross-border ecommerce, and other disruptive technologies expand trade in digital goods and services, intellectual property will be fair game – why couldn’t a company around the world simply replicate 3D printable products and designs Made in the USA? Another problem is data protectionism – rules on access and transport of data across borders. Europeans are imposing limits on companies’ access to consumer data, complicating U.S. businesses’ customer service and marketing; emerging markets such as Brazil and Vietnam are forcing foreign IT companies to locate servers and build data centers as a condition for market access, measure that costs companies millions in inefficiencies. A growing number of countries claim limits on access to data on the grounds of “national security” and “public safety”, familiar code words for protectionism. Digital protectionism risks balkanizing the global virtual economy just as tariffs siloed national markets in the 19th century when countries set out to collect revenue and promote infant industries – a self-defeating approach that took well over a century to undo, and is still alive and well in countries like India. The biggest losers of digital protectionism are American small businesses and consumers leveraging their laptops, iPads and smart phones to buy and sell goods and services around the planet. Trade policymakers however lag far behind today’s trade, which requires sophisticated rules on IP, piracy, copyrights, patents and trademarks, ecommerce, data flows, virtual currencies, and dispute settlement. The mega-regionals, especially the TTIP, are a perfect venue to start this process. Disintegration of trade policies risk disintegrating world markets. Just as after World War II, the global trading system rests in America’s hands. Three things are needed. The first is the approval of TPA, which unshackles U.S. negotiators to finalize TPP and TTIP. Most interesting for U.S. exporters, TPP and TTIP almost de facto merge into a superdeal: the United States and EU already have bilateral FTAs with several common partners belonging in TPP – Peru, Colombia, Chile, Australia, Singapore, Canada, and Mexico to name a few. What’s more, gatekeepers to markets with two-thirds of global spending power, TPP and TTIP will be giant magnetic docking stations to outsiders; China and Brazil, aiming to revive sagging growth, are interested. Once this happens, the TTIP-TPP superdeal will cover 80 percent of world’s output and approximate a multilateral agreement – and have cutting-edge common trade rules that could never be agreed in one Big Bang at the WTO. Second, also needed is a shift negotiation of plurilateral agreements – broad-based agreements among sub-sets of WTO members now negotiated in trade in services and in environmental goods and services, and proposed for investment and data security, and now also for trade facilitation sans India. The coalitions of the willing driving plurilaterals include the United States, EU, Japan, and many Latin American and Asian emerging markets disillusioned by India and its accomplices, Cuba, Bolivia, and Venezuela. A pivot in trade politics, China is looking to join the services plurilateral. Plurilaterals not only help American companies to export more; they enable Washington and its friends and allies to call the shots in global trade rulemaking – and isolate India, proving its policies self-defeating. The third deal that is needed is Washington Consensus II, for the global digital economy. In the 1990s, the Washington Consensus set off a wave of deep trade and investment liberalization across the developing and post-communist world, paving the way for a tidal wave of globalization. The digital economy has no equivalent. A broad group of stakeholders and thought-leaders – governments, international organizations, companies, and think-tanks – need to come together to articulate guidelines for nations’ behavior in the global digital economy. Given its infamous connotations, the digital deal could be called “Seoul Consensus”, highlighting Korea’s leap to a leader in digitization from a rural economy just a couple of decades ago. U.S. leadership is urgently needed to integrate the rapidly changing global trading system. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate.

#### Reviving trade key to resolve every major global hotspot

Miriam Sapiro 14, Visiting Fellow in the Global Economy and Development program at Brookings, former Deputy US Trade Representative, former Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council, “Why Trade Matters,” September 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2014/09/why%20trade%20matters/trade%20global%20views\_final.pdf

This policy brief explores the economic rationale and strategic imperative of an ambitious domestic and global trade agenda from the perspective of the United States. International trade is often viewed through the relatively narrow prism of trade-offs that might be made among domestic sectors or between trading partners, but it is important to consider also the impact that increased trade has on global growth, development and security. With that context in mind, this paper assesses the implications of the Asia-Pacific and European trade negotiations underway, including for countries that are not participating but aspire to join. It outlines some of the challenges that stand in the way of completion and ways in which they can be addressed. It examines whether the focus on “mega-regional” trade agreements comes at the expense of broader liberalization or acts as a catalyst to develop higher standards than might otherwise be possible. It concludes with policy recommendations for action by governments, legislators and stakeholders to address concerns that have been raised and create greater domestic support.¶ It is fair to ask whether we should be concerned about the future of international trade policy when dire developments are threatening the security interests of the United States and its partners in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Europe. In the Middle East, significant areas of Iraq have been overrun by a toxic offshoot of Al-Qaeda, civil war in Syria rages with no end in sight, and the Israeli-Palestinian peace process is in tatters. Nuclear negotiations with Iran have run into trouble, while Libya and Egypt face continuing instability and domestic challenges. In Asia, historic rivalries and disputes over territory have heightened tensions across the region, most acutely by China’s aggressive moves in the South China Sea towards Vietnam, Japan and the Philippines. Nuclear-armed North Korea remains isolated, reckless and unpredictable. In Africa, countries are struggling with rising terrorism, violence and corruption. In Europe, Russia continues to foment instability and destruction in eastern Ukraine. And within the European Union, lagging economic recovery and the surge in support for extremist parties have left people fearful of increasing violence against immigrants and minority groups and skeptical of further integration.¶ It is tempting to focus solely on these pressing problems and defer less urgent issues—such as forging new disciplines for international trade—to another day, especially when such issues pose challenges of their own. But that would be a mistake. A key motivation in building greater domestic and international consensus for advancing trade liberalization now is precisely the role that greater economic integration can play in opening up new avenues of opportunity for promoting development and increasing economic prosperity. Such initiatives can help stabilize key regions and strengthen the security of the United States and its partners.¶ The last century provides a powerful example of how expanding trade relations can help reduce global tensions and raise living standards. Following World War II, building stronger economic cooperation was a centerpiece of allied efforts to erase battle scars and embrace former enemies. In defeat, the economies of Germany, Italy and Japan faced ruin and people were on the verge of starvation. The United States led efforts to rebuild Europe and to repair Japan’s economy. A key element of the Marshall Plan, which established the foundation for unprecedented growth and the level of European integration that exists today, was to revive trade by reducing tariffs.1 Russia, and the eastern part of Europe that it controlled, refused to participate or receive such assistance. Decades later, as the Cold War ended, the United States and Western Europe sought to make up for lost time by providing significant technical and financial assistance to help integrate central and eastern European countries with the rest of Europe and the global economy. ¶ There have been subsequent calls for a “Marshall Plan” for other parts of the world,2 although the confluence of dedicated resources, coordinated support and existing capacity has been difficult to replicate. Nonetheless, important lessons have been learned about the valuable role economic development can play in defusing tensions, and how opening markets can hasten growth. There is again a growing recognition that economic security and national security are two sides of the same coin. General Carter Ham, who stepped down as head of U.S. Africa Command last year, observed the close connection between increasing prosperity and bolstering stability. During his time in Africa he had seen that “security and stability in many ways depends a lot more on economic growth and opportunity than it does on military strength.”3 Where people have opportunities for themselves and their children, he found, the result was better governance, increased respect for human rights and lower levels of conflict.¶ During his confirmation hearing last year, Secretary John Kerry stressed the link between economic and national security in the context of the competitiveness of the United States but the point also has broader application. Our nation cannot be strong abroad, he argued, if it is not strong at home, including by putting its own fiscal house in order. He asserted—rightly so—that “more than ever foreign policy is economic policy,” particularly in light of increasing competition for global resources and markets. Every day, he said, “that goes by where America is uncertain about engaging in that arena, or unwilling to put our best foot forward and win, unwilling to demonstrate our resolve to lead, is a day in which we weaken our nation itself.”4¶ Strengthening America’s economic security by cementing its economic alliances is not simply an option, but an imperative. A strong nation needs a strong economy that can generate growth, spur innovation and create jobs. This is true, of course, not only for the United States but also for its key partners and the rest of the global trading system. Much as the United States led the way in forging strong military alliances after World War II to discourage a resurgence of militant nationalism in Europe or Asia, now is the time to place equal emphasis on shoring up our collective economic security. A failure to act now could undermine international security and place stability in key regions in further jeopardy.

## Uniqueness

### Will Pass – Yes PC

#### Obama has PC – approval rating

Kelly 6/8

Nora Kelly is an associate editor at The Atlantic. “Hillary Makes History: With a series of decisive wins, Clinton secures the delegates she’ll need to become the first woman to be a major-party nominee.” JUN 8, 2016 http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/06/live-coverage-of-the-democratic-primaries/485912/

Obama will be gentle for now. But he's expected to offer aggressive advocacy for his former secretary of state. Obama has a decent amount of political capital these days, with approval ratings in the low 50s. As one political scientist told me last month, his surrogacy for Clinton will have meaning "because he’s not only the sitting president, but he’s essentially the titular head of the party."

### Will Pass – Obama Push

#### It’s now or never – Obama’s full court press is generating broad support

Needham 6/20

Vicki Needham, Trade Report @ The Hill, “U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman was optimistic on Monday that Congress would pass a sweeping Pacific Rim trade agreement this year.” http://thehill.com/policy/finance/trade/284119-froman-optimistic-congress-gets-tpp-done-this-year

Froman said broad support across the U.S. economy for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) — including agriculture, high-tech and manufacturing industries — is bolstering the Obama administration’s efforts to convince lawmakers to approve the 12-nation deal before President Obama leaves office. “That support is beginning to trickle through to members of Congress,” he said Monday at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York. “I’m spending a lot of my time, when I’m not traveling abroad, up on the Hill talking to members of Congress and the good news is that as they dig into the details and they see what’s in it for their constituents, which is their primary driving force behind their decision-making, they’re seeing the potential, the positive upside and what’s at risk in not getting it done,” he said. Despite opposition from the presumptive Democratic and Republican presidential nominees, a majority of congressional Democrats and most labor unions, Froman said he thinks the TPP has a good chance. “I think at the end of the day there will be the necessary support to get it done," he said. That optimism stems from the Obama administration and Congress making headway on a handful of issues that lawmakers have expressed concerns about since the agreement was completed in October. Froman said the main outstanding hurdle is the length of intellectual property protections for high-tech biologic medicines. The TPP offers up to eight years, but Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) has said he prefers 12 years, which is the U.S. standard. “We’re working with members of Congress and with the industry to try and find solutions there to reassure them about the issues that they care about without reopening the agreement or renegotiating,” Froman said. Agreement on another major issue — data localization — also is nearing the finishing line, he said. "I think we're quite close to reaching a resolution of that issue," Froman said. Wall Street groups have vowed to withhold their support for the TPP until the cross-border data provision was altered to their satisfaction. Even though the TPP deal isn't likely to get a vote in Congress until the lame-duck session after the November elections, Froman said the White House and the Cabinet will make a full-court press over the next several months in case a window opens for lawmakers to vote. The effort is similar last summer's strategy on trade promotion authority legislation. "We'd like to get it done as quickly as possible," Froman said. "I think there's a lot of desire to get it done and there's a recognition that if it doesn't get done this year it's unclear when it will get done," he said. "That has serious costs economically and politically and strategically." The Obama administration is consulting with congressional leaders and the committees — House Ways and Means and Senate Finance — to find the right time to vote on trade agreement, Froman said earlier Monday on CNBC's "Squawk Box." If the White House and Congress can't reach an agreement by year's end, Froman warned, any attempt by the next presidential administration to open up the deal for more changes would probably kill the agreement.

Obama is building support – now is key

Needham 5/2

Vicki Needham, Trade Report @ The Hill, “President Obama urging Congress to pass TPP” 05/02/16

http://thehill.com/policy/finance/trade/278459-president-obama-is-urging-congress-to-pass-tpp

President Obama on Monday said Congress needs to pass a sweeping Pacific Rim trade agreement to ensure the United States takes the reins of global trade in the region instead of China. The Obama administration is working closely with lawmakers on Capitol Hill to build support for the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), arguing that delaying votes on the deal will make it harder to pass the agreement, the president said in a Washington Post op-ed.

#### Obama push means deal is on track for passage

Fabian 5/23

Jordan Fabian, White House Correspondent at The Hill, “Obama confident trade deal will pass Congress”05/23/16 http://thehill.com/policy/finance/280872-obama-confident-trade-deal-will-pass-congress

Obama acknowledged during a news conference in Vietnam that passing trade deals is tough, especially during a political campaign when the issue is hotly debated. “Having said that, I remain confident we're going to get it done,” he told reporters. “It's good for the country. It's good for America. It's good for the region. It's good for the world.” Obama is looking to reassure Asian nations that the deal is still on track for passage despite growing political opposition to it in the U.S. The trade deal, which was finalized last fall, is the biggest piece of the administration's emerging relationship with Vietnam, a Cold War-era foe. Persuading Congress to ratify the 12-nation trade deal is near the top of Obama’s final-year agenda. But the TPP has drawn opposition from members in both parties in Congress along with the leading Democratic and Republican presidential candidates, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. Critics of the deal say it could lead to American firms shipping jobs overseas to countries with lower wages, including Vietnam. They also have said the labor and environmental protections in the deal are not strong enough. Despite the dwindling time left on this year’s congressional calendar and reluctance from House and Senate leaders to hold a vote on the package, Obama insisted the Pacific Rim trade pact has a strong chance of passage.

#### Obama rushing to get TPP passed – it’s TOA

Reuters 6/20

“Obama takes turn as 'America's pitch man' to help sell TPP trade deal” June 20, 2016 http://finance.yahoo.com/news/obama-takes-turn-americas-pitch-183226770.html

Obama argued that while there are legitimate concerns about boosting wages and improving working conditions, ultimately global trade can help connect people from around the world and reduce poverty. "This is not just about jobs and trade, it's not just about hard cold cash," he said. "It's also about building relationships across borders. When your companies come together you help bring countries and cultures together." American business lobby groups have been pushing the White House and congressional leaders to finish their work to ratify the TPP before the next administration takes office. Obama's top economic adviser sidestepped a question on a conference call about the timeline. "We're continuing to work with congressional leaders to find the right opportunity, the right window of opportunity, to get TPP passed this year," Jeff Zients, the director of the National Economic Council, told reporters. On Monday, Obama announced a $70 million matching grant to a Los Angeles "manufacturing hub," a group of businesses and researchers piloting sensors and other technology to help factories cut costs and energy use. It is the ninth of 15 planned hubs that the White House hopes will boost manufacturing across the country. On Friday, Obama will continue his pitch for business, speaking about technology and the economy on a panel with Facebook Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg at another summit at Stanford University aimed at boosting entrepreneurs in developing countries.

#### Will Pass – Obama Push

Adam Behsudi 6/16, Trade correspondent for Politico, 6/16/2016, Politico, “Hatch: Obama willing to dance on TPP”, http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-trade/2016/06/hatch-obama-willing-to-dance-on-tpp-214854

HATCH: OBAMA WILLING TO DANCE ON TPP: Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch said the Obama administration for the first time appears to be willing to meet his demands on TPP. "Let's put it this way, this is the first time that they've been willing to say they want to meet the needs that I say they've got to meet," Hatch told reporters Wednesday shortly after speaking by phone to President Barack Obama. "They know this isn't a matter of me being stubborn, this is a matter of getting it done right." Hatch repeated that he still wants 12 years of data protection for biologics in the TPP instead of the current formulation that provides at most eight years of protection and possibly only five. He also said a provision that prevents tobacco companies from using investor-state dispute settlement has cost TPP at least 13-16 votes in the House and eight or more in the Senate. Because of those two issues and some other important ones, TPP doesn't have the votes to pass, said Hatch, who stopped to speak with reporters after a hearing on digital trade. NEVER GIVING UP ON BIOLOGICS: Hatch said the administration appears to recognize he's not going to give in on the biologics issue, so they have to find some way to provide 12 years of data protection. "They can solve this problem with side agreements and some other approaches," Hatch said. "It's not an unsolvable problem. It's just that they got themselves in a bind where they agreed to do this for Australia, and now all the other countries want that done" as well. Despite the big problems, Hatch said he wasn't worried time is running out to get TPP done. However, the only real chance is between the November election and Jan. 20, when the next president takes office, he said. TPP COULD MEAN THE WORLD FOR TTIP: Passage of TPP could pave the way for the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, Hatch also said Wednesday. "If we get TPP done, TTIP should come along," Hatch told reporters after a hearing on digital trade and counterfeiting. "The TTIP people are learning a lot from what's happening on TPP." Hatch emphasized that he was prepared to work hard to pass TPP if the administration addresses his concerns. "[TPP] is a very, very important bill. It sets the stage for TTIP," Hatch said. "If we can do this and make this work, it sets the stage for international trade for a long time to come." SPEAKING OF THE TTIP CALENDAR: Slovakia, which takes over the presidency of the Council of the European Union on July 1, on Wednesday released a provisional calendar of important meeting dates for the second half of the year. Among the highlights: an informal meeting of EU trade ministers in Bratislava on Sept. 22-23, where they plan to review progress on TTIP. The first formal trade council is on Nov. 11, which could be a significant date for the talks as well. The full calendar is here. FROMAN MEETS WITH NEW DEMOCRAT COALITION: U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman made the rounds on Capitol Hill on Wednesday with the message that TPP needs to pass this year, especially given China’s progress on the rival Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, and to update lawmakers on progress being made on certain outstanding issues, Morning Trade has learned. Among his engagements, Froman met with members of the moderate New Democrat Coalition, which provided 23 of the 28 Dem votes granting Obama fast-track authority. "U.S. Trade Representative Ambassador Mike Froman joined the New Dems today for their weekly Member lunch. He discussed the discuss the status of TPP, TTIP, recent trade enforcement efforts, and other key trade issues, as he has done in the past,” a senior aide said. “New Dems appreciate the ambassador's ongoing efforts to answer member questions and discuss anything they may be hearing back home from their constituents about current trade agreements."

### Will Pass – Momentum

#### Will Pass – Compromise on data storage generates momentum

Needham 5/25

Vicki Needham, Trade Report @ The Hill, “Obama administration strikes deal on TPP data storage” 05/25/16 http://thehill.com/policy/finance/trade/281294-obama-administration-strikes-deal-on-data-storage-concerns-in-tpp

The Obama administration said Wednesday that it has reached an agreement with the financial services industry that could smooth passage of the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement. The thrust of the new proposal, which is aimed at placating concerns about a provision in the TPP that could give foreign governments the ability to require U.S. businesses to maintain data servers within their borders, would broadly prohibit requirements for data storage. The overhauled framework would apply only to ongoing and future trade negotiations — such as the Trade in Services Agreement, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership with the European Union and the U.S.-China Bilateral Investment Treaty — and not to the Pacific Rim pact. U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman called the compromise “an important, collaborative solution that will help build momentum for reaching consensus in other areas of TPP.” "It shows that when we dig into the details with stakeholders and members of Congress we can find common ground approaches that satisfy a range of priorities," Froman said. "As we continue our collaborative work on how TPP will be implemented and enforced, we expect the already strong support for TPP to continue to grow.”

### Will Pass – Business Push

#### This year is key – business lobbies are pushing for a vote before the end of the year – they’re actively lobbying congresspersons

Allsup 6/22

Maeve, Bloomberg News“Lack of TPP Action Concerns Business Leaders” June 22, 2016 http://www.bna.com/lack-tpp-action-n57982074560/

June 21 — It’s crunch time for business leaders and U.S. companies hoping for congressional approval of the trans-Pacific trade agreement by the end of the year. “There is a strong view that getting TPP done this year is absolutely critical,” said Linda Dempsey, vice president of international economic affairs at the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM). And regardless of the outcome of November’s presidential election, it is unlikely that the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) will be high on the agenda when a new president takes office and a new Congress convenes in January, she said. Sarah Thorn, senior director of federal government relations for Walmart, said she hopes there will be a vote in the lame duck session and is confident that “we will see accelerated activities this fall,” when there is a more pressing timeline. While U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman has said the administration has made “great strides” in building support for the TPP, it continues to face headwinds in Congress (115 ITD, 6/15/16). Key lawmakers, such as Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), are demanding changes in several areas of the agreement, including the length of protections for biologic pharmaceuticals, financial services data localization and investor protections for tobacco products. In addition, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, the presumptive Democratic and Republican nominees in the 2016 presidential contest, have pledged to redo or scrap the agreement entirely. Stronger Commitment Sought In a June 16 letter to Obama and congressional leaders, business groups asked for a stronger commitment to ensuring the Trans-Pacific Partnership is passed by the end of the year. Business Roundtable President John Engler, National Association of Manufacturers President and Chief Executive Officer Jay Timmons and U.S. Chamber of Commerce President and CEO Thomas Donohue called for Congress and the administration to work with the business community to get TPP passed as soon as possible. “We urge you to redouble efforts and forge a path forward to approve the TPP this year,” they wrote. “If the TPP is not approved this year, the United States will jeopardize a huge opportunity for U.S. growth, jobs, and leadership,” they warned. Taking a Stand Several of the U.S.’s largest companies have taken public positions in support of the TPP and have said they are working closely with Congress to get it passed.

### Will Pass – TOA

#### It’s TOA

Miller 6/20

Campaign trail newsman for The Washington Times, “Obama touts TPP trade deal, bucks opposition from Clinton, Trump” June 20, 2016 http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2016/jun/20/obama-touts-tpp-trade-deal-bucks-opposition-hillar/

President Obama pushed Monday for passage of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement that is stuck in Congress, defying anti-trade rhetoric from likely Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, whom he endorsed. In a speech at a federally sponsored global business summit in Washington, the president rattled off a list of purported benefits from the deal with 12 Pacific Rim nations. “When we’ve gotten it done, the Trans-Pacific Partnership will do even more to lower the costs of exporting, eliminating taxes and custom duties and raising intellectual property standards that protect data and ideas and jobs,” Mr. Obama told business leaders at the SelectUSA Summit. Mr. Obama has made passing the trade deal, know as TPP, a top priority for his last year in office. But he faces strong political headwinds from Mrs. Clinton and presumptive GOP nominee Donald Trump, whose opposition to trade agreements could stymie a Republican-run Congress that’s usually pro-free trade. The president mentioned the trade deal as part of a pitch at the SelectUSA Summit for business investment in the U.S. It was the first in a series of events this week to highlight American business innovation during his presidency. The massive trade deal — which includes Australia, Japan, Peru, Singapore and New Zealand — is an essential element of the legacy Mr. Obama is attempting to mold before he leaves office Jan. 20.

#### Deal is TOA

Fabian 5/23

Jordan Fabian, White House Correspondent at The Hill, “Obama confident trade deal will pass Congress”05/23/16 http://thehill.com/policy/finance/280872-obama-confident-trade-deal-will-pass-congress

Obama acknowledged during a news conference in Vietnam that passing trade deals is tough, especially during a political campaign when the issue is hotly debated. “Having said that, I remain confident we're going to get it done,” he told reporters. “It's good for the country. It's good for America. It's good for the region. It's good for the world.” Obama is looking to reassure Asian nations that the deal is still on track for passage despite growing political opposition to it in the U.S. The trade deal, which was finalized last fall, is the biggest piece of the administration's emerging relationship with Vietnam, a Cold War-era foe. Persuading Congress to ratify the 12-nation trade deal is near the top of Obama’s final-year agenda. But the TPP has drawn opposition from members in both parties in Congress along with the leading Democratic and Republican presidential candidates, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. Critics of the deal say it could lead to American firms shipping jobs overseas to countries with lower wages, including Vietnam. They also have said the labor and environmental protections in the deal are not strong enough. Despite the dwindling time left on this year’s congressional calendar and reluctance from House and Senate leaders to hold a vote on the package, Obama insisted the Pacific Rim trade pact has a strong chance of passage.

### Will Pass – Key Industry

#### Footwear lobbying generates key leverage

Needham 5/18

Vicki Needham, Trade Report @ The Hill, “Footwear executives pound pavement for Obama trade deal” http://thehill.com/policy/finance/280452-footwear-executives-pound-pavement-for-obama-trade-deal

The U.S. footwear industry is ramping up a lobbying campaign behind President Obama’s Pacific Rim trade agreement. The Footwear Distributors and Retailers Association (FDRA) and nearly three dozen of its members were canvassing Capitol Hill on Wednesday, urging lawmakers to pass the 12-nation Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), which they say will significantly reduce tariffs and create jobs. “Our message is now is the time to get this thing done,” said Matt Priest, FDRA’s president, whose group represents more than 120 companies and 250 brands. “This is really is about American jobs, domestic manufacturing jobs, retail jobs, warehouse jobs and consumers,” he said. Priest said the group’s members span across nearly every congressional district in the country, which he called “advantageous to our effort.” "We will use that leverage as an organization to ensure that members know the importance of how TPP will drive things to consumers and help drive jobs," he said. The footwear industry paid $3 billion in duties last year, even with very little domestic production, and the TPP could quickly slash more than half a billion off those costs, a reduction that Priest called “very significant.” Tariffs on footwear average from about 10 percent and can reach up to 67.5 percent. The footwear industry has been a consistent ally of the Obama administration’s trade agenda and the TPP.

### Will Pass – Primary Politics Over

#### TPP will pass – post primary politics

Spiering 4/24

Charlie, DC Reporter at Breitbart News, “Obama Confident Trans-Pacific Partnership Will Pass After Political Primaries” 24 Apr 2016 http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/04/24/obama-confident-trans-pacific-partnership-will-pass-political-primaries/

President Obama expressed confidence that his Trans-Pacific Partnership deal will pass Congress after members survive their contentious primaries and the presidential nominees of both parties are sorted out. “I think after the primary season is over the politics settle down a little bit in Congress, and we’ll be in a position to start moving forward,” Obama explained during a press conference with Angela Merkel in Germany today. Obama reminded reporters that a majority of Congress already passed the authorities for his administration to negotiate the complex deal with 11 countries, and it was only a matter of political nervousness.

## PC Key

#### Post-election passage requires PC

J Berkshire Miller 6/15, Director of the Council on International Policy, 6/15/2016, *Al-Jazeera*, “Time is running out on TPP”, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2016/06/time-running-tpp-160613091202942.html

Now there are serious concerns that the deal will not get through before the Obama administration leaves office and will be either held up, re-opened or become redundant under the next president. The Obama administration is facing pressure from a number of groups opposed to the deal and - like the case in most free trade agreements - will have to make a number of side deals with internal stakeholders to garner sufficient support to get the legislation through Congress. Most ideal scenario Key opposition from the Republican side revolves around biologics and the fact that the TPP doesn't contain the 12 years of data protection for biologic medicine. This protection was made law through the Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009, which serves to strengthen intellectual property protections for pharmaceutical companies in the US. Orrin Hatch, the Senate Finance Committee chairman, is one their key backers and will be an important player for the administration to have on-side if it wants to get the TPP put into force before its mandate ends. In an ideal world, the Obama administration would look to get the deal ratified during its "lame-duck" session - immediately following the election in November and before the new president-elect takes office in January. Obama's top trade envoy Michael Froman has taken a sanguine view that the deal be put into force, noting: "There is a pathway forward here and what we're trying to do right now is just maximise the likelihood that we’ll be able to walk down that path successfully." But while there is cautious optimism in the Obama administration, the timelines and sensitivities attached to election politics do not portend well for the deal being struck by the end of the year. It will require political capital that is needed on other key priorities such as the confirmation of Merrick Garland to the Supreme Court. Despite the fact that the TPP was largely pushed under her watch as Secretary of State, Clinton has been forced to distance herself from it due to concerns that her base has on its impact on US jobs. The Republicans are similarly boxed in with the presumptive nomination of Donald Trump - who has blasted the deal. This has tempered their support for the TPP due the timing and the signal its ratification might deliver. Despite the strategic imperative of ratifying the pact, it appears that deal's approval is hanging by a thread.

#### PC key to Lame-Duck TPP-Resolves concerns

Jackie Calmes 6/1, Staff Writer for the New YorkTimes, 6/1/2016, *The New York Times,* “Trans-Pacific Partnership Supporters Pin Hopes on Lame-Duck Vote”, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/02/business/trans-pacific-partnership-supporters-pin-hopes-on-lame-duck-vote.html

“Right now you have a president, a majority leader and a speaker who are all pro-trade,” Mr. Obama’s trade ambassador, Michael B. Froman, said in an interview, reflecting a seize-the-moment recognition of the changed lineup ahead. He is not alone in that reckoning, although many people in both parties declined to be quoted by name given the tenuous politics of the issue. Besides a new president, the Senate could have a new majority leader next year, Senator Charles E. Schumer of New York, if Democrats win control, and he is unlikely to promote an issue that so divides the union-friendly party. “There is a pathway forward here,” Mr. Froman said. “And what we’re trying to do right now is just maximize the likelihood that we’ll be able to walk down that path successfully.” Whether that is wishful thinking or a real prospect will have to come into focus well before November because supporters would likely need to begin congressional hearings in September to clear the path for a vote in the lame-duck session of Congress after Election Day. And the forces do seem aligned against the pact’s approval. Months ago, Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the majority leader who is pro-trade but worried about keeping Republican seats, ruled out a vote before the election. The so-called T.P.P. would phase out thousands of tariffs, open markets and impose new trade rules, including for labor rights and environmental standards, on signatory nations that span both sides of the Pacific, including Japan, Vietnam, Australia, Canada, Chile and Mexico. And Mrs. Clinton appears to have put her finger on the scale against a vote in the lame-duck session. Asked by an anti-T.P.P. group if she would oppose a lame-duck vote on the accord if elected, Mrs. Clinton responded, “I have said I oppose the T.P.P. agreement — and that means before and after the election.” Representative Sander Levin of Michigan, House Democrats’ point person on trade, was blunt. “T.P.P. cannot pass this session as negotiated,” he said. “There were always major problems as they negotiated it,” he added, “so I don’t want people to think it’s simply because of the presidential race.” Indeed, Mr. Obama acknowledged he faced an uphill push when the agreement, in the works since the George W. Bush administration, was announced in October. The hostility toward trade agreements has built over decades as manufacturing jobs shifted overseas and middle-income wages stagnated. Those politics have only grown more toxic, stoked by anti-trade blasts from Mr. Trump in the Republicans’ nomination contest and Mr. Sanders in his challenge to the Democrats’ front-runner, Mrs. Clinton. Pressured by Mr. Sanders, Mrs. Clinton turned on the agreement she had praised as the “gold standard” during negotiations. Not since the Depression has a Republican nominee opposed free trade and favored high tariffs on imports, but Mr. Trump’s hard line potentially threatens Mrs. Clinton’s support in manufacturing states. He has called the Pacific agreement “the biggest betrayal in a long line of betrayals where politicians have sold out U.S. workers” — a stance that separates him from the Republican Party’s highest-ranking elected official, pro-trade Speaker Paul D. Ryan of Wisconsin, who so far has declined to endorse Mr. Trump. Mrs. Clinton, by her stand, has forsaken the New Democrat trade legacy that her husband as president and now Mr. Obama forged for their less-than-receptive party by introducing labor, human rights and environmental protections into trade agreements. Trade supporters have long counted on action in a lame-duck Congress. But they did not count on Mr. Trump being the nominee. His election could likely doom the accord, T.P.P. advocates concede, by dissuading Republican leaders from advancing an issue their party’s standard-bearer so opposes. But some Republicans do not rule out a vote, because, they say, the deal deserves consideration or because Mr. Trump will not be elected. Even a lame-duck strategy necessitates some action before the election. Under the terms of trade legislation that helped Mr. Obama complete the accord, Congress must hold public hearings on the agreement before it is voted on, and a lame-duck session would not provide enough time for committee action and House and Senate debates. Mr. Obama, in Vietnam recently, predicted that Congress would ratify the accord. A big reason for administration confidence is that Congress a year ago narrowly voted to give the president so-called trade-promotion authority, which puts T.P.P. on a legislative fast track, ruling out amendments and requiring just 51 votes in the Senate, not 60. And with T.P.P. in hand, supporters are pointing to potential gains for American exporters. “We think there’s some opportunity to pick up some people, given the specific benefits to their districts,” Mr. Froman said. For example, supporters hope the strong backing of beef producers and other agriculture groups will hold down defections among House Republicans in rural districts who fear Mr. Trump’s backlash. “T.P.P. is going to take our tariff rate from 38½ percent to 9 percent” for American beef sold in Japan, said Kent Bacus, director of international trade for the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association. That would erase Australia’s advantage in Japan since the two nations reached a separate trade agreement last year, costing American exporters roughly $300 million in market share. Agriculture groups will hold pro-T.P.P. events in lawmakers’ districts this summer, Mr. Bacus said. “They’re going to listen to their constituents. We’re not going away,” he said. Mr. Froman for months has been meeting with lawmakers to address their complaints and with other nations’ trade ministers, to goad their countries to act on their T.P.P. commitments now – on labor rights, for example – so that he can reassure Congress’s doubters. Mexico’s president recently sent legislation to his Congress that would address American complaints about its restrictions on unions. Such reforms have been a priority of Senator Ron Wyden of Oregon, the pro-trade lead Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee responsible for T.P.P., although they are unlikely to satisfy most American unions. Just last week, the administration, the financial services industry and its backers in Congress settled on a policy addressing other nations’ requirements for local storage of companies’ financial data abroad. The administration also has allayed concerns among dairy groups and among pork producers concerned about new subsidies in Japan for its industry. That leaves one main issue to settle, supporters say, over provisions reducing American pharmaceutical companies’ monopoly control of advanced drugs known as biologics. The industry opposes the change and has a prime ally: Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Republican of Utah and chairman of the Finance Committee. In a statement, Mr. Hatch said, “If the president wants T.P.P. to be approved, he will need to work with Congress to address concerns. I’m hopeful that, at the end of the day, I, along with many of my colleagues, will be able to support a strong T.P.P.” His House counterpart, Representative Kevin Brady, Republican of Texas and chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in a statement extolled the agreement. But he said he would “continue to work with the administration to resolve members’ outstanding concerns.”

#### PC key-Obama’s pushing

Ayesha Rascoe and Roberta Rampton 6/20, Reporters for Reuters, 6/20/2016, *Reuters*, “Obama takes turn as 'America's pitch man' to help sell TPP trade deal”, http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-obama-trade-idUSKCN0Z625H

President Barack Obama made a plug on Monday for the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal to a group of 2,400 investors looking at locating business in the United States, saying the deal would help boost the global economy. Trade has become a hot-button issue in the Nov. 8 presidential election campaign, with presumptive candidates from both parties voicing objections to the 12-nation TPP deal that Obama wants the U.S. Congress to sign off on before his time in office ends on Jan. 20. Both the Republican and Democratic presidential campaigns have tapped into populist skepticism about the benefit of trade deals on jobs and wages, particularly in the manufacturing sector. Obama tried to dispel the economic gloom-and-doom coming from the campaign trail, extolling the recovery of the United States from recession. "I don't mind being America's pitch man," Obama said in a speech at the SelectUSA Summit. "In seven months or so, I'll be on the job market, and I'm glad I'm going to be here. I'm going to get on LinkedIn and see what comes up," he quipped. Obama argued that while there are legitimate concerns about boosting wages and improving working conditions, ultimately global trade can help connect people from around the world and reduce poverty. "This is not just about jobs and trade, it's not just about hard cold cash," he said. "It's also about building relationships across borders. When your companies come together you help bring countries and cultures together." American business lobby groups have been pushing the White House and congressional leaders to finish their work to ratify the TPP before the next administration takes office. Obama's top economic adviser sidestepped a question on a conference call about the timeline. "We're continuing to work with congressional leaders to find the right opportunity, the right window of opportunity, to get TPP passed this year," Jeff Zients, the director of the National Economic Council, told reporters. On Monday, Obama announced a $70 million matching grant to a Los Angeles "manufacturing hub," a group of businesses and researchers piloting sensors and other technology to help factories cut costs and energy use. It is the ninth of 15 planned hubs that the White House hopes will boost manufacturing across the country. On Friday, Obama will continue his pitch for business, speaking about technology and the economy on a panel with Facebook Chief Executive Mark Zuckerberg at another summit at Stanford University aimed at boosting entrepreneurs in developing countries.

#### PC key on TPP and trade - empirically proven with Kennedy

Boustany and Zoellick 14 - senior member of the House Ways and Means Committee - former USTR, president of the World Bank (Charles and Robert, "A Trade Opportunity for Obama and the New Congress" Wall Street Journal -- www.wsj.com/articles/charles-boustany-and-robert-b-zoellick-a-trade-opportunity-for-obama-and-the-new-congress-1419811308)//SB

After the midterm elections, political commentators identified trade policy as one area for cooperation between President Obama and the Republican Congress. We agree. Under the U.S. Constitution, Congress has authority over trade. But the active direction and use of that authority depends on an energetic executive, in partnership with Congress.∂ According to a recent Pew Research survey, 66% of Americans believe greater U.S. involvement in the global economy is a “good thing,” with only 25% thinking it is bad. The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement is a “good thing” in the eyes of 55% of Americans, versus 25% who consider it bad; the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) scores 53% good and 20% bad. These inclinations offer opportunity.∂ Prof. Richard Neustadt explained to President John F. Kennedy that the presidency relied on the “power to persuade.” It’s time for Mr. Obama to persuade on trade. He must make use of the convening power of the executive to bolster his advocacy. His administration must work closely with Congress—to listen, explain, address problems and cut deals.

#### PC key on trade issues specifically - horse-trading enables Obama to pass TPP

Feehery 15 -John Feehery is president of QGA Public Affairs and a former spokesman for then-House Speaker Dennis Hastert (John Feehery, June 10, 2015, Wall Street Journal, http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2015/06/10/why-trade-promotion-bill-is-so-hard-to-pass-through-congress/)//SB

Passing trade legislation is always controversial. One ~~man’s~~ job-creating trade agreement spells the end of another man’s job. Mr. Obama waited until the last two years of his presidency to push for fast track, when he didn’t have to run again in the face of angry union opposition. It helped that the Republicans had seized the reins of power in the Senate and are largely sympathetic to the arguments of free traders. Trade is much more complex than broadly understood. Every country with which we trade has laws designed to help domestic manufacturers. There are tax provisions and subsidies and favorable regulatory breaks and no-interest loans and a list of other things that foreign governments do to help their workers. We do some of that stuff ourselves. Making sense of these complex laws to help constituents and domestic industries in the face of international competition is the job of Congress. Some purists might want Congress to butt out, to let the invisible hand of the free market to work its will. But that’s not realistic from either a political standpoint or from a policy standpoint. At its heart, trade policy is a political matter and the politicians have to have the ability to represent their constituents. So, if a member of the House needs a provision to buffer the impact of lower tariffs for Vietnamese textiles, so be it. If a senator needs to point to additional tools to protest against illegal dumping of products from overseas, that’s the way it should be. On trade votes, you really get a chance to see the legislative process work. To the casual observer, this might seem like the usual sausage making. But to those in the middle of the scrum, all of this horse-trading makes the sausage taste better to their constituents.

#### Free trade is “tough politics” - PC key to overcome opposition on both sides

**Reuters** **14** (December 3, 2014, "Obama says will make strong push for fast-track trade authority"www.reuters.com/article/2014/12/03/us-usa-trade-obama-idUSKCN0JH24220141203)//SB

Obama said free trade is "tough politics" among some lawmakers because many Americans feel their wages and income have stagnated as a result of foreign trade.∂ He said his argument to U.S. labor unions and environmental groups concerned about the impact of free-trade agreements is that new trade deals, such as the 12-country Trans-Pacific Partnership, will help raise labor and environmental standards.∂ "Part of my argument to Democrats is: don't fight the last war," Obama told the Business Roundtable, noting that companies wanting to move offshore for cheaper labor had probably already done so.∂ Fifty percent of Americans think trade destroys jobs and 45 percent think it lowers wages, according to a poll from the Pew Research Center. Obama said anti-trade sentiment had also increased among Republicans.

### Dem Unity I/L

#### Dem unity key to TPP passage-Overcomes concerns

Kavin Gozstola 6/26, Staff writer for Shadowproof Press, 6/26/16, “Democrats Prioritize Party Unity Over Including Stand Against TPP In Platform”, http://www.commondreams.org/views/2016/06/26/democrats-prioritize-party-unity-over-including-stand-against-tpp-platform

Members of the Democratic National Convention Platform Committee shot down an attempt to include specific opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade deal in the platform, despite the fact that both Democratic presidential candidates have taken positions against the TPP. The attempt failed because members appointed by Hillary Clinton and DNC Chairwoman Debbie Wasserman Schultz claimed it was improper to oppose the TPP when President Barack Obama fervently believes in the agreement. However, by putting party unity before taking a firm stand against the trade agreement, the door was left open for Clinton to go back to supporting the TPP, which was the case when she was secretary of state. “It is hard for me to understand why Secretary Clinton’s delegates won’t stand behind Secretary Clinton’s positions in the party’s platform,” Democratic presidential candidate Bernie Sanders said Representative Keith Ellison, who was appointed by Sanders campaign, proposed the following language for the platform: “It is the policy of the Democratic Party that the Trans-Pacific Partnership must not get a vote in this Congress or future sessions of Congress.” In arguing for this position, Ellison acknowledged a key issue is the investor state dispute resolution systems “usurp national sovereignty.” For example, as later mentioned by environmental activist Bill McKibben, TransCanada has brought a claim under the North Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) against the U.S. government for $10 billion because the Keystone XL pipeline. Food safety, the extension of monopoly drug patents, and human rights are also fundamental issues, Ellison added. The TPP would grant Malaysia, “one of the worst human traffickers, privileged access to the U.S. market.” “Our workers wouldn’t be competing against low wage. They’ll be competing against no wage,” Ellison said. It also would empower Vietnam, even though the country jails political dissidents, commits systematic union repression, and uses child labor. “We’ve had moving testimony about how our trade policy, particularly after the aftermath of NAFTA, has really inflicted real pain on real families. I’ll never forget the gentleman who testified who was losing his job from Nabisco in Chicago,” Ellison shared. Ellison recognized, “Some people, who have promoted the TPP, are fairly highly placed in the Democratic Party, but I can tell you as a member of the Democratic caucus” that there is a “substantial concern about the TPP.” He suggested most votes for TPP would come from the Republicans. Cornel West pled with members to “take a stand.” “We can agree with him on some things, disagree with him on others,” West declared. “I think he’s wrong on this issue. This is really about corporate power, and those of us who are very suspicious of corporate power and fundamentally committed to democratic accountability and transparency, not secretive operations and fast tracks and so forth.” West added, “It says much about who we are as a nation, as a party, in terms of TPP. It’s not just some fetishized policy, but it’s a fundamental expression of who we are vis-a-vis people power and corporate power.” The case for supporting the inclusion of this language of the platform expanded, as McKibben noted that there was little to no diversity of views on this issue. “Every interest group that we’ve heard from, human rights groups, labor groups, and environmental groups, have been firm in their denunciation of TPP. McKibben spoke about the dispute resolution system that TransCanada is wielding to its advantage and said it reflected the “deeply anti-democratic nature of these trade agreements in a modern age, which have far less to do with free trade than they do with untrammeled corporate power and that untrammeled corporate power has a great deal to do with the rampant income inequality that we decry time and time again in this platform.” Deborah Parker, an indigenous woman appointed by Sanders, registered her support, saying “unfettered free trade deals have been rigged by corporate America” for decades. She not only is concerned for workers in the United States but also workers in countries like China and Mexico. But none of the above was enough to move the Clinton and DNC chairwoman appointees. In fact, it seems to make them more resolute in their belief that putting party unity before taking a stand on the TPP was the right thing to do. “The platform language should affirm what our candidates said but not imply that Democrats are all in agreement and say that the Democratic Party is now taking a platform position in opposition to what significant parts of the Democratic Party currently hold to,” Paul Booth, executive assistant to the president of AFSCME incoherently declared. Representative Luis Gutierrez boasted about his record opposing trade agreements. He bragged that no president could move him to support free trade deals. Yet, he said, “What I don’t want to do is leave this place disregarding the position of the President of the United States, who is the leader of our party today, independent of my disagreement with him.” “I’ve been taken away in handcuffs more than once in my disagreement with this President of the United States, but this is the moment to bring our party together and I don’t want to send a message of disunity,” Gutierrez added. Even platform committee chair, Representative E.J. Cummings, chose to vote against the resolution. He, too, bragged about not voting for trade agreements. “I don’t want to do anything as he ends his term to undercut the president of the United States. I’m just not going to do it. And that’s where I stand,” Cummings proclaimed. “It wouldn’t bother me. It would be a harder decision if the language that we have in the document did not already go to what we feel going forward. But in his last six months, I’m not going to do that. So, that’s where I stand.” There was only one member of the platform, who stood up for the TPP. Former Representative Howard Berman, appointed by the DNC chairwoman, stated, “The president’s right in what he is doing. There are serious foreign policy, national securities wrapped up in this,” he said, and disputed whether free trade agreements were responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs. Everyone but Sanders’ appointees cowered under the banner of party unity to avoid taking a strong stance. “I never like taking a position against the President, but there are certain things that are just little more important. Seeing our working class just erode in part because of the trade deals is something that I don’t want to stand for,” Ellison responded. “I’d like to do something strong.” McKibben argued, “This document [the platform] is less about the current situation than about going forward and thinking about even future generations. I think in this case if we don’t adopt this resolution we miss a real opportunity for party unity.” “This is one of the issues on which Secretary Clinton and Senator Sanders agreed. It was an important moment in the campaign when Secretary Clinton was willing to say she was against the TPP,” McKibben continued. “It was one of the things that has been held up in her favor by people, and I think that if we do not ratify as part of the platform it will help those many people feel suspicious in ways that people across our political spectrum feel suspicious about political leaders. I think it would be an act of support for the party going forward to agree on this thing that they have actually agreed on.” Again, the only reason why Clinton appointees would not want to put this in the platform was if Clinton was planning to backtrack on her opposition to the TPP if she is elected president. West stepped up to make an eloquent statement about “profound loyalty to the President.” “It strikes me that in many ways it’s salutary. I can understand it, what it means to be a member of party and have a leader going through what President Barack Obama has gone through in eight years. But it just strikes me as well that in the end we’re citizens, and a citizen has a fundamental commitment to truth and justice even beyond a party and leader,” West declared. West added, “If my dear brother Bernie Sanders were president and I thought he was wrong on an issue, I would tell him candidly in private and directly in public, but with a support but a critical support.” Cummings took this as a personal attack against him and reacted, “There is nobody that fights harder for poor and working people than I do. I mean, every day.” But, as West stated later, “Any time we use the language of party unity, and some of us are convinced that a particular policy has devastating impact on working people, we’re then talking about a form of unity that’s predicated on the backs of working people.” Booth put forward a resolution afterward, which included weaker language that indicated there is disagreement over the TPP among Democrats. It was an odd amendment because it gave corporate Democrats cover to support a trade deal that everyone on the platform committee claims is antithetical to the values of Democrats. “It would be one thing if this was the very first trade agreement that we were debating, Trans-Pacific Partnership. We had one side take one position and another side take another position,” Warren Gunnels, policy adviser to the Sanders campaign, argued. “The problem is we’ve been down this road before. We were told in 1993, 1994, that NAFTA would create a million jobs over the first five years, and we all know—we’ve had over 20 years experience now—that NAFTA has led to the loss of over 850,000 jobs.” “Then, in 1999, we were told that permanent trade relations with China would create jobs in the United states. It would be a 100-0 deal in favor of this country. What happened was the United States ended up losing 3.2 million jobs because of permanent normal trade relations with China. Now the experts tell us if the Trans-Pacific Partnership passes, the United States will lose another half millions jobs,” according to Gunnels. [\*Note: Gunnels is a non-voting member of the platform committee.] James Zogby, who was appointed by Sanders, weighed in, because he believed the way that Booth conceptualized his resolution might be appealing to him later in the proceedings. For example, what if they could acknowledge not all Democrats support perpetual war? In any case, Zogby ultimately stated, “I find it not acceptable to fudge it in the way that we are, especially when we have agreement among the candidates and we have agreement among the majority of our Democratic constituency, not just in Congress but across the board nationally. This is an issue around which there’s consensus, broad consensus, and I think we owe it to ourselves and to the principle to be firm on it.” However, loyalty to party and the President of the United States trumped conscience and principles. On top of that, Center for American Progress president Neera Tanden, appointed by Clinton, patronizingly addressed all the Sanders appointees upset with the craven members of the committee. “I take all your comments, and I think a lot of people around this table oppose the TPP,” Tanden said. “I think the issue about the previous amendment was just frankly about the President’s position. But I don’t take away any of the statements you made. Many of us are in wholehearted agreement with your criticism of TPP and free trade deals.” In fact, the Clinton and DNC chairwoman appointees were not in “wholehearted agreement.” They could not be moved to act on their opposition to the TPP in a manner that would show solidarity with working class Americans across the country, who have suffered through the staggering impact of destructive trade deals.

## Neg PC Real

#### Political Capital is Relevant

#### a. Multiple Studies confirm that a presidents’ influence can switch votes

Beckmann and Kumar 11 [Department of Political Science at the University of California; “How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking”; 2011; Journal of Theoretical Politics 23(1) 3–20]

Fortunately for those inside the West Wing, some researchers paint a more optimistic picture regarding presidents’ potential for passing important planks of their legislative agenda. Covington et al. (1995), Barrett and Eshbaugh-Soha (2007), Edwards III and Barrett (2000), Kellerman (1984), Light (1982), Peterson (1990), and Rudalevige (2002) all observe that presidents secure greater support for their ‘priority’ items, and when they exert ‘effort’ pushing them. In addition, Covington (1987) concludes that White House officials can occasionally win greater support among legislators by working behind the scenes, while Canes-Wrone (2001, 2005) shows that presidents can induce support from a recalcitrant Congress by strategically ‘going public’ when advocating popular proposals (see also Kernell (1993)). Sullivan (1987, 1988) finds that presidents can amass winning congressional coalitions by changing members’ positions as a bill moves through the legislative process.

#### b. it overcomes partisan gridlock

Beckmann and McGann 08(Matthew N. Beckmann is an Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine and Matthew N. Beckmann is an Associate Professor of Political science at UC Irvine, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2008)

Here we propose a theory that casts some early rays of light onto the policy consequences of polarization in Congress. Building from a simple theoretical model in which the president seeks to promote his preferred policies in the Senate (see Snyder, 1991; Groseclose, 1996), we assess differences in the chamber’s preference distribution – from normal to unanimous to bimodal – as well as the ‘political capital’ at the president’s disposal.2 Results show that absent the president, ideological polarization makes amassing the votes needed to beat the status quo difficult, so gridlock frequently prevails. The same is true when the president lacks political capital to spend. However, when endowed with abundant capital, facing a polarized legislature enables presidents to pass policies closer to their ideal than would have been possible in an assembly characterized by greater ideological homogeneity. Hence the familiar prediction of blanket ‘gridlock’ is overblown. Instead, comparative statics show that the consequences of ideological polarization in Congress are conditional: they depend on the nature of the preference distribution, the involvement of the president, and the political capital at his disposal.

#### Political capital is key to switching votes

Kuttner 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power)

As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, **the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade."** Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, **a president possesses several points of leverage**. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and **using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction**. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.

#### History proves that capital is effective --- backroom negotiations can produce agreements

Mandel, Assistant Editor Commentary Magazine, 3-23-’12 (Seth, “Contentious Lessons of Presidential Persuasion: Be the Commander-in-Chief” http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/03/23/presidential-persuasion-commander-in-chief-obama-reagan-clinton/)

I want to offer Klein one more note of optimism. He writes:

Back-room bargains and quiet negotiations do not, however, present an inspiring vision of the Presidency. And they fail, too. Boehner and Obama spent much of last summer sitting in a room together, but, ultimately, the Speaker didn’t make a private deal with the President for the same reason that Republican legislators don’t swoon over a public speech by him: he is the leader of the Democratic Party, and if he wins they lose. This suggests that, as the two parties become more sharply divided, it may become increasingly difficult for a President to govern—and there’s little that he can do about it.

I disagree. The details of the deal matter, not just the party lines about the dispute. There is no way the backroom negotiations Clinton conducted with Gingrich over social security reform could have been possible if we had prime ministers, instead of presidents. The president possesses political capital Congress doesn’t. History tells us there are effective ways to use that capital. One lesson: quiet action on domestic policy, visible and audible leadership on national security.

### AT Winners Win

#### Winners don’t win – even if they do *in theory*, Obama thinks fights drain PC

Eberly 1-21 - assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland

Todd, “The presidential power trap,” Baltimore Sun, Lexis

Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. Presidents in recent years from have been unable to prevent their political capital eroding. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.¶ However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.

#### Limited bargaining chips – Fighting for passage of the plan FORCES a trades off with other agenda priorities

Beckman & Kumar, 11 --- Department of Poli Sci and UC Irvine (Matthew N. Beckmann and Vimal Kumar, Journal of Theoretical Politics, “How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking,” SAGE Journals Database)

2. The Wellsprings of Positive Presidential Power When it comes to presidents’ negative power, that is, the veto, its source is plain enough: the Constitution. By contrast, the wellsprings of presidents’ positive power are far less definite, far less durable. Although the Constitution authorizes the president to ‘recommend . . . measures as he shall deem necessary and expedient’ (Article 2, section 3), it does not require that lawmakers afford those measures any special consideration, or any consideration at all. Such a tenuous institutional anchor is what led Richard Neustadt to characterize presidents’ positive power as ‘hard to consolidate, easy to dissipate, rarely assured’ (Neustadt, 1990: ix). However, to say the wellsprings of positive presidential power are extra-constitutional and variable is not to say they are unknowable or idiosyncratic. In fact, Neustadt himself characterized their essence: ‘presidential power is the power to persuade’ (1990: xi) or ‘the power to bargain’ (1990: 32). Presidents’ positive position in lawmaking, then, is not a formal, constitutional role, but rather an informal lobbying role, one that Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson advocated, and all presidents since Franklin Roosevelt have implemented (see Collier (1997)). Harry Truman summarized the outlook: ‘The legislative job of the President is especially important…I sometimes express it by saying the President is the only lobbyist that [most] Americans have’ (25 October 1956). As with all lobbyists, presidents looking to push legislation must do so indirectly by pushing the lawmakers whom they need to pass it. Or, as Richard Nesustadt artfully explained: The essence of a President’s persuasive task, with congressmen and everybody else, is to induce them to believe that what he wants of them is what their own appraisal of their own responsibilities requires them to do in their interest, not his…Persuasion deals in the coin of self-interest with men who have some freedom to reject what they find counterfeit. (Neustadt, 1990: 40) Fortunately for contemporary presidents, today’s White House affords its occupants an unrivaled supply of persuasive carrots and sticks. Beyond the office’s unique visibility and prestige, among both citizens and their representatives in Congress, presidents may also sway lawmakers by using their discretion in budgeting and/or rulemaking, unique fundraising and campaigning capacity, control over executive and judicial nominations, veto power, or numerous other options under the chief executive’s control. Plainly, when it comes to the arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading that so often characterizes legislative battles, modern presidents are uniquely well equipped for the fight. In the following we employ the omnibus concept of ‘presidential political capital’ to capture this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining.1 Specifically, we define presidents’ political capital as the class of tactics White House officials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior.2 Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only meshes with previous scholarship on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also presidential practice.3 For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members: The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237) Of course, presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a floating value. Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a finite supply of political capital; he can only promise or pressure so much. What is more, this capital ebbs and flows as realities and/or perceptions change. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, however important those margins may be (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how presidents may systematically influence them.

### AT Dickerson

#### Obama can’t implement that Dickerson strategy effectively

Tom Blumer is president of Monetary Matters, a training and development company in Mason, Ohio. He presents workshops on money management, retirement, and investing, 1-22-2013 <http://frontpagemag.com/2013/tom-blumer/obamas-startling-second-inaugural-admission/>

Though it was indeed, as the Politico’s Glenn Thrush correctly noted, “the most liberal speech he has delivered as president,” it clearly disappointed some of those in the establishment press who wanted to hear Obama go for his opponents’ jugulars. That group includes John Dickerson, who has been Political Director at CBS News since November 2011.¶ Dickerson put on his best game face at Slate after the speech, but it’s clear from reading his previous 2,000-word battle plan disguised as a column on Friday that Obama didn’t go as far as he would have liked.¶ The column’s headlines called for Obama to “Go for the Throat!” and “declare war on the Republican Party.” In his content, Dickerson claimed that Republican recalcitrance meant that “Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize,” and that the president “can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP.” Slate was so thrilled with the piece that it amped up its “most popular” tease list title to read: “Why Obama Should Seek To Destroy the Republican Party.” Dickerson’s occupation of such an influential perch at CBS and the presence of so many others like him at other news outlets largely explain why last year’s establishment press coverage of the GOP primaries and the general election was so ruthlessly biased against Republicans and especially conservatives.

## Links

### Engagement Costs PC

#### Internal divide over engaging China guarantees opposition

Gries ’14 – Harold J. & Ruth Newman Chair in U.S.-China Issues and director of the University of Oklahoma's Institute for U.S.-China Issues

(Peter Hays, April 2014, The Politics of American Foreign Policy, date accessed: 6.22.16, pages 209-210, accessible at http://www.ou.edu/uschina/gries/articles/texts/Gries.2014.Ch9.pdf)//AP

Both the Democratic and Republican Parties are internally divided over China. On the left, some Democrats argue for a pro-China policy of engagement to better integrate China into the global economic, political, and security orders. Other Democrats, concerned about human rights issues, advocate for tougher China policies. For instance, California congresswoman Nancy Pelosi, quoted above, has been a frequent critic of Chinese human rights abuses. Yet other Democrats on Capitol Hill, many from heavily blue collar districts, join Big Labor in condemning unfair Chinese trade practices and advocating tougher U.S. trade policies towards China.

On the right, Republicans in Washington are equally divided on China policy. Business conservatives have historically promoted a friendlier China policy conducive to increased trade, investment, and profits. For instance, the U.S.-China Business Council and AmCham China, which lobby on behalf of U.S. companies doing business with China, have worked closely with many Republicans on the Hill to support pro-China and block anti-China legislation. Military hawks and Christian conservatives, however, usually argue for tougher China policies. Congressman Randy Forbes of Virginia, quoted in the epigraph, serves on the House Armed Services Committee and cochairs the House’s China Caucus, and frequently promotes tougher positions on China. New Jersey congressman Christopher Smith, who has held dozens of hearings on Capitol Hill to deplore China’s lack of religious freedoms, has also advocated a tougher U.S. China policy, but for very different reasons. “China’s continued repression of religion is among the most despotic in the world,” Smith, a Christian conservative who founded the House Pro-Life Caucus, argues. “Today, numerous underground Roman Catholic priests and bishops and Protestant pastors languish in the infamous concentration camps of China for simply proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”

#### Plan costs PC – deep strategic mistrust from politicians

Goldstein ’15 – associate professor in the Strategic Research Department at the US Naval War College (NWC)

(Lyle J., 2015, Meeting China Halfway, Georgetown University Press, Project Muse, date accessed: 6.24.16, Page 330-331 of the Conclusion, https://muse.jhu.edu/book/39628)//AP

US-China relations remain mired in suspicion regrettably. While any forward progress is welcome, of course, the steps cited above are mostly symbolic, representing, for the most part, repackaging of long held policies rather than genuine negotiated compromises. The measures emerging from the late 2014 summit will unfortunately not stabilize the relationship over the long term, nor provide definitive solutions to the most grave issues confronting the relationship and global security more generally. These measures may simply move the relationship from deeply fraught to extremely tense and will do little to break down the veritable chasm of strategic mistrust that presently divides Washington and Beijing. In the strategic realm, since 2011 Washington has embarked on a “rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific,” while Beijing seems ever more determined to press its maritime claims and simultaneously believes that the United States is determined to contain and stifle China’s rise. Most troubling of all, the military establishments in both the United States and China each appears to hold that they must earnestly prepare for rivalry and even direct conflict. Although, for the moment, the relationship is still guided by pragmatists, there is no denying a certain intense loathing—extant in the larger body politic, but also felt intensely among political elites and bureaucrats in the corridors of power. This hostility was born of historical enmity, cultural divergence, and above all ideological estrangement. When geopolitical rivalry, undergirded by the “natural laws” of realism, is added to this volatile mix, conflict between the United States and China may appear to be dauntingly overdetermined.

#### Engagement is politically impossible – human rights concerns

Lieberthal and Jisi ’12 – a senior fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at Brookings; Dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University.

(Kenneth and Wang, John L. Thornton China Center Monograph Series • Number 4 • March 2012; date accessed: 6.20.16, “Addressing U.S.-China Strategic Distrust,” date accessed: 6.20.16, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/3/30-us-china-lieberthal/0330\_china\_lieberthal.pdf)//AP

The U.S. also has long believed that democratic political systems are inherently more legitimate domestically and therefore inherently more stable and that officials in democratic systems have a much better understanding of the nature of politics in the U.S. itself. It is felt that officials in democracies are, therefore, less likely to misjudge what is marginal and what is central in U.S. politics – and therefore are less likely to impute hostile intent to the U.S. when marginal players say outrageous things. This, in turn, makes it less likely that hostilities will arise between the U.S. and other democracies.

Given fundamental American values, what are seen as human rights violations (especially, violations of civil rights) in China and other countries make it politically very difficult for the U.S. government to undertake actions with such countries that aim first of all to build mutual trust. Americans tend to be deeply suspicious of countries that trample on the civil rights of their own citizens. For historical reasons, the fact that China is governed by a communist party in a one-party system inherently creates misgivings among many Americans, including high level officials, and makes it still harder to establish full mutual trust. This factor is more subtle than in the past but still is an element in the trust equation.

#### Congress opposes – political incentive to perpetuate narrative that China’s rise undermines US leadership

Bendini ’16 – ‎Senior administrator at European Parliament

(Roberto, “United States - China relations: a complex balance between cooperation and confrontation,” European Union, Policy Department, Directorate-General for External Policies; date accessed: 6.20.16, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/IDAN/2016/570464/EXPO\_IDA(2016)570464\_EN.pdf)//AP

US-China relations are of great significance for the entire world. The two countries’ respective economic weight, global influence and military capacities make them key actors in the effective resolution of the different issues at stake. China’s greater involvement in these issues, and its use of multilateral institutions to do so, are positive news for the stability and security of the world. On the other hand, tensions and potential conflicts arising from diverging interests between China and the US represent threats to the world order, and require improved mutual understanding and level-headed pragmatism. Officials and politicians from both countries could be tempted to paint China’s rise as a zero-sum game for domestic political purposes. On such a basis, China and the US could not be equal great powers without each having to fight the other to become or remain so. This way of thinking could eventually result in a disastrous conflict or a Cold War- type stand-off.

#### Engagement with China requires PC

Harris ’15 – Assistant Professor in the Department of Political Science at Colorado State University.

(Peter, "The Imminent US Strategic Adjustment to China," Chinese Journal of International Politics (Autumn 2015) 8 (3): 219-250.

doi: 10.1093/cjip/pov007, First published online: July 30, 2015, http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/8/3/219.full)//AP

This must change. As Evelyn Goh has demonstrated, attitudes towards other states—and China in particular—are socially constructed and can be manipulated,[98](http://cjip.oxfordjournals.org/content/8/3/219.full#fn-98) but the rehabilitation of China in the US political psyche will not occur of its own volition; political will must be expended in order to achieve the goal. At present, such political will appears to be sorely lacking, yet this is what must be accomplished if the US political system is to bear a grand strategy oriented towards accepting the rise in power of China on the world stage and the concessions that will have to be made in order to make this possible.

### AIIB

#### AIIB saps PC—GOP doesn’t want to invest the capital required

Zhang, 15

(Xunchao, international affairs observer, sub-editor of ACYA Journal of Australia-China Affairs as well as a member of the Center for International Maritime Security (CIMSEC), “AIIB: a Test of Sino-US Relations," Australian Institute of International Affairs, September 25, 2015, http://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australian\_outlook/aiib-a-test-of-sino-us-relations/MS)

As most US allies had deserted the US on opposing the AIIB, the United States found its attempt to “isolate” China turned into “self-isolation”. Hence, it became the rational Washington to change its strategy based on the new international context. As argued in a [National Interest article](http://nationalinterest.org/feature/no-escape-america-should-join-chinas-new-bank-12508), it is obvious that by late March that the most rational damage-control measure Obama administration can take is to participate in the AIIB project. Given the change of mind, why Washington did not join the AIIB after all? This is because such logical option is ruled out by the Republican-control over Congress. For the US to join the AIIB, it has to make billions of dollars of capital contribution, such funding would not be approved by the Republican-dominated Congress. Especially given President Obama’s fights with the Congress on several foreign policy issues, such as the approval of the nuclear agreement with Iran, and rapprochement with Cuba, there is no political capital to be spare for the AIIB. The lesson for the United States is clear: If the US is going to conceptualize its alliances and partnerships as a one-way street on which partners are to follow Washington regardless of their own national interests, or allowing its foreign policy to be bogged down by domestic infighting, the AIIB would not be the last US foreign policy setback.

### Arctic Links

#### Plan costs PC – no congressional support for Arctic funding

AND 14, Alaska Dispatch News, Alaskan News Source, 6/29/2014, “AK Beat: Anchorage police say driver in fatal Seward Highway crash was intoxicated”, http://www.adn.com/alaska-beat/article/ak-beat-congress-skeptical-coast-guards-polar-icebreaker-plans/2014/07/29/

Coast Guard icebreaker plans get skeptical audience in Congress: How important is the Arctic to the U.S. Coast Guard? Some Republican lawmakers expressed their doubts in a House subcommittee meeting last week, reports naval publication Seapower Magazine. The remarks came as the lawmakers considered appropriating funds for research into building a new icebreaker. The U.S. currently has three polar icebreakers, two of which are active, the magazine reported. "Chairman Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Calif., said a lot of people within the Coast Guard are talking about the high priority of the Arctic, but no one is allotting any money toward it," Seapower reported. "Hunter also said several times throughout the hearing that this could be the last one he schedules on the Arctic because he does not believe the Coast Guard wants an icebreaker." Alaska's lone representative, Republican Don Young, asked the Coast Guard to consider leasing an icebreaker, since the current Congress was unlikely to appropriate funds to build one, according to the report.

### BIT

#### You just lost to politics

Dayden ’15 – contributing writer

(David Dayden, 11-30-2015, "The Job-Killing Trade Deal You’ve Never Heard Of: The China Bilateral Investment Treaty," American Prospect, http://prospect.org/article/job-killing-trade-deal-you%E2%80%99ve-never-heard-china-bilateral-investment-treaty)//AP

The 2016 election has highlighted growing public opposition [in both parties](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/mar/07/donald-trump-why-americans-support) to the status-quo globalization agenda, which both sides blame for outsourcing jobs and privileging corporate profits over ordinary workers. This populist voter backlash puts trade agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) [on life support](http://www.salon.com/2016/03/15/bernie_sanders_the_death_of_tpp_why_his_stunning_michigan_upset_could_be_the_final_nail_in_the_free_trade_coffin/), and is forcing candidates to better explain how they would boost jobs and wages. But what if those voters learned that the Obama administration is in the midst of negotiating yet another corporate-friendly trade deal, one that would facilitate more offshoring, and that could also give China, of all countries, effective veto power over domestic policy? That’s precisely what’s happening in behind-the-scenes negotiations over a little-publicized agreement on the table between the U.S. and China, the world’s two largest economies. Just as the White House is trying to sell TPP as a bulwark against China, the administration is simultaneously seeking an investment treaty with the Chinese that undercuts that argument. “It really calls into question the contention of the Obama administration that they have a coherent strategy to integrate trade and international relations and national security,” says Barry Lynn, a senior fellow at New America. “It shows they have no idea what they’re doing.” The deal is called the [China Bilateral Investment Treaty](http://origin.www.uscc.gov/sites/default/files/Research/EIU_Report_on_US-China_BIT--FINAL_14_April_2010.pdf), or BIT. This is a standalone compact which would normally be negotiated as the investment chapter in a broader free trade agreement. Investment treaties provide a framework for foreign investors to pursue direct corporate ownership stakes in a partner country, offering them a series of guarantees of non-discriminatory treatment, limits on the expropriation of capital, and access to extra-judicial tribunals to enforce the agreement. The latter are set up through a system known as the investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) process, which has [expanded in scope](https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43052.pdf) in recent years as a key protection for foreign investors. In fact, ISDS has proven hugely controversial in the TPP debate, with critics charging it would allow corporations to overturn national laws that constrain their profits. The U.S. has implemented 41 BITs over the years, as well as investment chapters in a dozen free-trade agreements. But the U.S. already attracts more foreign direct investment than any country in the world, with $168 billion flowing in just in 2012. That includes investments from countries that until now have lacked the protections of a BIT, like China. “It’s pitched as a way to promote investment,” said Celeste Drake, trade and globalization policy specialist at the AFL-CIO. “We’re one of the top countries for foreign investment anyway. We don’t need to give away rights for foreign investors.” Few investors have the capital to undertake and manage businesses overseas. Invariably, large multinational corporations, or investment vehicles like hedge funds and private equity firms, engage in foreign direct investment. And a BIT offers them the ability to lock in profits while neutralizing the risks that go along with investing abroad. For example, U.S. companies operating in China encounter local corruption, preferential treatment for their domestic producers, intellectual property theft, and ever-changing regulatory demands. The BIT sweeps away such hurdles, and allows foreign investors to use ISDS to recoup lost profits if foreign governments use those maneuvers to hamper their business. It effectively removes American companies’ one big motivation for keeping manufacturing stateside—our relatively stable judicial and regulatory systems and rule of law. If companies can get all that guaranteed in China, there’s nothing keeping their factories here. The BIT, then, is a recipe for more outsourcing. China currently protects many of its industries by excluding foreign investment in certain sectors. The key to the BIT is what’s known in trade deal parlance as the “negative list”—a list of which sectors would stay excluded. U.S. corporations want to whittle down that list and pry open more sectors where they can invest in China, and subsequently move production overseas. On the flip side, there’s already substantial Chinese investment in the U.S.—more than U.S. investment in China, in fact—but we don’t have good information on its impact. Many Chinese companies are state-owned or state-influenced, subsidized from home, and freed from having to run an immediate profit. Michael Wessel, a commissioner on the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, [warns](http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/235081-growing-us-china-investment-not-a-bit) that Chinese-subsidized firms could squeeze domestic competitors by undercutting them on price. Despite this uncertainty, Wessel contends that not single case study on Chinese-invested firms has been undertaken by an independent expert. “We have no idea what Chinese companies are doing in the U.S.,” he says. “Not all investment has [the] same impact. Our negotiators are flying blind.” When you contemplate Chinese state-owned enterprises enjoying the same treatment on their investments as domestic producers, and having the ability to use ISDS to maintain those privileges, things get even more alarming. “ISDS puts corporations and sovereign governments on the same plane,” says the AFL-CIO's Drake. “This would be China acting through a corporation to challenge a U.S. law.” Under ISDS, Chinese companies could sue federal, state, or local governments over any laws that force them to alter their production facilities. They could potentially sue the [Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States](https://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/international/Pages/Committee-on-Foreign-Investment-in-US.aspx) (CFIUS), which approves all foreign investment transactions, even though this panel’s reviews are normally not subject to judicial oversight. The U.S. could try to restrict state-owned enterprises, but without broadly-written language, Chinese companies would be likely to circumvent such constraints. “We’ve talked to U.S. negotiators, they don’t seem disturbed by it,” Drake adds. “I’m disturbed that they’re not disturbed.” While most of these agreements look similar to the “model BIT,” a template treaty available at the [State Department website](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/188371.pdf), the administration has been strangely silent when it comes to its China trade negotiations. Administration officials haven’t publicly announced any negotiation sessions, nor have they briefed cleared trade advisers, who are supposed to be able to look at trade deals as they happen. “This is more secretive than the TPP,” says Wessel, who is also a cleared adviser. We do know that both sides are eager to finish the BIT, after 24 rounds of talks.Politico Pro [reported this week](https://www.politicopro.com/trade/story/2016/03/us-hopes-for-the-best-ahead-of-new-china-bit-offer-101551) that the White House expects a new “negative list” offer from China before President Xi Jinping arrives for a summit later this month. The Obama administration called completing the BIT before the president leaves office a “top economic priority” following [an Obama-Xi meeting](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/25/fact-sheet-us-china-economic-relations) in September. Xi has also [expressed interest](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2015twosession/2015-03/05/content_19730226_2.htm) in accelerating the talks, especially in light of China’s weakening economy and its need for foreign investment. Wrapping up the BIT negotiations, however, would trigger a political explosion. Given that the leading Republican candidate assails trade deals with China in every public address, tossing another U.S./China treaty into the mix would fan an already volatile political fire. Like other treaties, the BIT would require a two-thirds vote for Senate ratification. That would be a difficult lift in a year with a [record Chinese trade deficit](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/reuters/article-3476644/U-S-trade-deficit-widens-exports-hit-5-1-2-year-low.html) and high anxiety over the downsides of globalization. The BIT’s presence also undermines the geopolitical case for TPP, since one of the main arguments for that treaty is that it’s needed to “contain” China. “If you’re saying TPP is for strategic reasons and doing this at the same time and not telling us anything about it, what are we to expect?” asks Lynn of New America. “We have to assume it’s a giveaway, and we have to assume your claims about TPP are bogus.” China has ignored many of the commitments imposed on it following its entry into the World Trade Organization, and critics fear the Chinese would not live up to their obligations on the BIT either. And even amid the secrecy surrounding the deal, many question the value of letting China invest more in the United States, or letting U.S. corporations escape domestic laws and regulations, effectively turning capitalism into a heads-I-win, tails-you-lose game. Investment rules acceptable to corporate executives aren’t necessarily good for workers. And pushing another deal that accelerates the hollowing out of the nation’s industrial base, in an election year, borders on political insanity.

#### Political tensions on both sides

Dollar ’16 – Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Global Economy and Development, John L. Thornton China Center

(David Dollar, 5-18-2016, date accessed: 6.26.16, "What do China’s global investments mean for China, the U.S., and the world?," Brookings Institution, http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/order-from-chaos/posts/2016/05/18-china-global-investment-dollar)//AP

This issue of getting China to open up its protected markets is high on the policy agenda of the United States and other major economies. The United States has been negotiating with China over a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) that would be based on a small negative list; that is, there would be a small number of agreed sectors that remain closed on each side, but otherwise investment would be open in both directions. So far, however, negotiations on the BIT have been slow. It is difficult for China to come up with an offer that includes only a small number of protected sectors. And there are questions as to whether the U.S. Congress would approve an investment treaty with China in the current political environment, even if a good one were negotiated.

#### Plan costs PC – bipartisan opposition to Chinese investment – espionage and economic competitiveness concerns

Gantz ’14 (David, Samuel M. Fegtly Professor of Law and Director, International Trade and Business Law Program, University of Arizona, James E. Rogers College of Law. “CHALLENGES FOR THE UNITED STATES IN NEGOTIATING A BIT WITH CHINA: RECONCILING RECIPROCAL INVESTMENT PROTECTION WITH POLICY CONCERNS” - Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law - Summer, 2014, http://arizonajournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/2-Gantz-Final.pdf /MS)

The U.S.-China BIT negotiations are taking place at a time of political friction between the United States and China that is unprecedented in recent years. The Chinese hacking of both commercial and governmental websites in the United States has become a serious national security issue, and U.S. authorities are increasingly direct in accusing the Chinese government of stealing military and other technology. 19 With the Edward Snowden disclosures, Chinese authorities have a reciprocal argument to make. Smoldering Chinese territorial disputes over islands in the East and South China Seas with Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, and Vietnam threaten to embroil the United States in the event that any of the directly involved nations overreacts.20 Nor, in the view of the United States, has the Chinese government done enough to quell the aggressiveness of its client state, North Korea.21 In the past five years, the United States has initiated more than ninety antidumping and countervailing duty investigations against a variety of Chinese products, including various iron and steel goods, solar panels, wind towers, shrimp, and citric acid.22 These unfair trade actions are viewed by China, rightly or wrongly, as having political as well as economic motivations. Also, China clearly perceives the TPP as an economic and political threat,23 an important part of the Obama Administration’s “pivot” toward a more aggressive role in Asia undeniably designed in significant part to counter-balance Chinese hegemony in the region. These conflicts make Chinese citizens suspicious of the United States and undermine respect for China among many Americans. China is regularly (if today less accurately than in the past) accused of undervaluing its currency,25 and many, both in Congress and elsewhere, oppose Chinese investment in the United States because of concerns that the enterprises so established, for example in telecommunications, will be used for spying or other forms of espionage.26 Even those proposed investments that are totally innocuous from a national security point of view, such as the recent purchase of the Smithfield Ham group by Chinese interests, engender objections by some in Congress. 27 U.S. interests worry that serious air quality problems in China, with Chinese-sourced particulate pollution already affecting California, will carry over to the United States should the Chinese invest in resource development in the United States. 28 Other Americans are simply concerned with abysmal working conditions in the electronics industry or in textiles and clothing,29 or less specific fears of China’s overtaking the United States as the world’s leading economic power30 and that nation’s emergence as a growing security threat.31 Further, concerns have been raised regarding the competitive advantage subsidized state-owned Chinese enterprises (SOEs) have over private enterprises in the West when it comes to seeking technology and investments in other countries, 32 as well as within China. Even if the U.S. negotiators are successful in concluding the BIT, they will have to convince U.S. stakeholders, the Senate, and civil society that facilitating Chinese investment in the United States is in the national interest.

Lawmakers oppose investment – concerns over currency and economic competitiveness

Mauldin 4/12/16 (William, reporter for the Wall Street Journal, *China Investment in U.S. Economy Set for Record, But Political Concerns Grow,*http://www.wsj.com/articles/china-investment-in-u-s-economy-set-for-record-but-political-concerns-grow-1460422802/MS)

Chinese direct investment in the U.S. economy is set to reach a new high this year due to a wave of deals announced in early 2016. But experts say the pace is already slowing as politicians and regulators increase their scrutiny of Chinese details. Chinese companies are expected to invest $20 billion to $30 billion in the U.S. in 2016, mainly through mergers and acquisitions, compared with a record $15 billion last year and $11.9 billion in 2014, according to a report published Tuesday by research firm Rhodium Group and the National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, which promotes cooperation between Beijing and Washington. The investment is starting to attract attention, including among Washington regulators and politicians in the 2016 campaign season. Many voters are expressing deep mistrust of U.S. economic and trade ties [as Donald Trump criticizes moves by China, Mexico and Japan](http://www.wsj.com/articles/how-trumps-hard-line-on-trade-could-backfire-1458848243). Despite its ascent to the world’s second-biggest economy, China has so far invested little in the U.S. compared with the American investments coming from firms based in the U.K., Japanese and other advanced economies. Only one-eighth of China’s $120 billion in outward investment last year went to the U.S., according to the report. Companies in North America trailed those in Europe and Asia as targets of Chinese acquisitions in 2015, Dealogic says. But the amount invested in the U.S. is growing rapidly as China plows less into commodity-rich developing countries as Beijing seeks to shift the economy toward technology, services and greater consumer spending. “They’re scrambling to upgrade their technology, they’re scrambling to build household brands quickly,” said Thilo Hanemann, economist at the Rhodium Group. “We’re seeing a big shift in Chinese investment from the developing world and emerging markets to high-income markets including the U.S., Europe and Australia. The first quarter saw [Chinese bids for U.S. companies at a dizzying pace](http://www.wsj.com/articles/chinese-companies-shopping-abroad-at-record-pace-1454506310), in part an effort to diversify abroad after the country’s market turmoil last August and concerns about a shift in the dollar-yuan exchange rate. Now, some U.S. acquisition targets are more worried about the ability of Chinese companies—many controlled by the state—to get the green light for foreign deals and obtain financing, Mr. Hanemann said. Without major new deals—such as [Anbang Insurance Group Co.’s unsuccessful $13.2 billion bid for Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide](http://www.wsj.com/articles/anbangs-pursuit-of-starwood-always-faced-high-hurdles-1459756559) Inc.—the pace of acquisitions and “greenfield” investments could ease off for the rest of the year, resulting in a “conservative” estimate of $20 billion to $30 billion for 2016, Mr. Hanemann said. But the total could be much higher if giant U.S. companies get promising bids in coming months. In Switzerland, China National Chemical Corp.’s $43 billion bid for Swiss pesticide and seed company Syngenta AG helped boost China’s bids for European assets to $61 billion this year, according to Dealogic. Also weighing on the deals is stepped-up attention from regulators, including the Committee on Foreign Investment in the U.S., which evaluates acquisitions of American business on national-security grounds. Washington lawmakers have pressed U.S. officials to scrutinize deals involving financial infrastructure, such as the Chicago Stock Exchange, and strategic semiconductor technology. “It certainly could have an impact on the psychology of Chinese buyers—they have a perception that it could be difficult to do a deal in an election year,” Mr. Hanemann said. Some lawmakers are crying foul, protesting that U.S. firms can’t invest easily in many sectors of China’s economy, while the U.S. market is wide open for their Chinese competitors, or nearly so. Efforts to negotiate a bilateral investment treaty between the two countries have stalled as Beijing has sought to rope off numerous industries. Still, Chinese-affiliated companies extend across 362 out of 435 congressional districts, according to the report. New York has benefited from Chinese deals related to tourism and financial services, while the Southeast is seeing investments from petrochemicals to manufacturing. Chicago ranked third on the report’s list of congressional districts in terms of Chinese direct investment in the last 15 years, and the Chicago Stock Exchange triggered alarm bells in Washington this year after it agreed to be bought by a Chinese firm. “We don’t necessarily want to be invested in by trading partners and have to be overly concerned that they might be getting a better deal from us that what we’re getting from them,” said Rep. Danny Davis (D., Ill.) whose district includes the exchange. Mr. Davis said he has concerns about the U.S. trade deficit and alleged Chinese currency manipulation but understands the deal for his hometown stock exchange, which handles only a fraction of daily U.S. equity trades, is part of living in a global economy.

### Climate Cooperation Links

Berman 14 (senior associate editor at *The Atlantic*, where he covers political news. He was previously a congressional reporter for *The Hill* and a Washington correspondent for *The New York Sun*, *The Angry GOP Backlash to Obama's Historic Climate* *Accord,* February 12, 2014, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/11/the-angry-gop-backlash-to-obamas-historic-climate-accord/382676/MS)

Within hours of the surprise announcement that President Obama had struck a landmark climate-change accord with China, the statements flooded in from Republicans. They were, predictably, apoplectic. The leaders of the incoming GOP Congress said the president had it out for the American energy consumer and vowed to stop his enhanced regulatory scheme come January. “This announcement is yet another sign that the president intends to double down on his job-crushing policies no matter how devastating the impact for America’s heartland and the country as a whole," House Speaker John Boehner said. "And it is the latest example of the president’s crusade against affordable, reliable energy that is already hurting jobs and squeezing middle-class families." Mitch McConnell, the incoming Senate majority leader, who is the preeminent protector of coal in the Congress, said the deal was "an unrealistic plan" that would "ensure higher utility rates and far fewer jobs." The chief climate-change denier in the Senate, and the likely next chairman of the its environment committee, James Inhofe, [denounced the pact as a "non-binding charade."](http://www.inhofe.senate.gov/newsroom/press-releases/inhofe-us-china-climate-deal-a-non-binding-charade) Never mind the GOP's decision to dispense with the now-quaint tradition of not criticizing the president while he is on foreign soil; the one-note statements underscore the significant shift—Democrats would say regression—on climate politics that has taken place during the six years of Obama's presidency. It was in 2007, after all, that [Newt Gingrich sat next to Nancy Pelosi](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qi6n_-wB154) and called for action to combat climate change, and a year later Republicans nominated a man in John McCain who had endorsed cap-and-trade legislation to reduce carbon emissions. By striking a pact with China, Obama essentially has called the GOP's bluff. As the party shifted against the Democratic climate agenda in 2009, Republicans turned abroad, arguing that it would be pointless for the U.S. to adopt regulations that could impose higher costs on consumers if leading global polluters like China and India did not follow suit. ([Mother Jones has put together a good mashup of Republican statements to this effect](http://www.motherjones.com/blue-marble/2014/11/awkward-supercut-republicans-using-china-excuse-climate-inaction?utm_source=huffingtonpost.com&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=pubexchange_article).) By striking a pact with China, Obama essentially has called their bluff, and an explicit aim of the accord is to spur other nations to make similar agreements at a global conference next year in Paris. With an eye toward those past statements, two senior Republicans on the House Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative Fred Upton and Representative Ed Whitfield, focused on the parameters of the deal, in which China is promising merely to stop its annual increase in carbon emissions by "around 2030" while the U.S. is committing to steep reductions for itself. "America's pain is truly China's gain," Upton and Whitfield said, "and if the president has his way, Americans will continue to be at a disadvantage for many years to come. The Chinese are promising to double their emissions while the administration is going around Congress to impose drastic new regulations inhibiting our own growth and competitiveness." To some extent, the shift in political momentum on climate change had its roots in the economic collapse of 2008, when in the minds of many Americans, the short-term costs of action came to outweigh the long-term benefits to the environment. And it was a lack of support from Democrats in the Senate that prevented the House-passed cap-and-trade bill from becoming law. "America's pain is truly China's gain." But now the upper ranks of the Republican Party are united in opposition to any mandatory carbon caps, and they have made EPA climate regulations a top target in 2015. The Obama administration, of course, [saw all of this coming](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/us/politics/obama-pursuing-climate-accord-in-lieu-of-treaty.html?_r=0), which is why you won't see the word "treaty" anywhere in the climate agreements either with China or other nations. The deal does not require Senate ratification, but it is more vulnerable to undoing from Obama's successor, as when President George W. Bush pulled out of the Kyoto Protocol upon taking office in 2001. Tuesday's accord lends a measure of global prestige to a president who has been diminished at home. But Obama knows that when he returns from Asia, he'll quickly have to get back on climate-change defense as he confronts resurgent Republicans on Capitol Hill.

#### Plan costs PC – opposition to energy cooperation efforts

Hongzhou ’15 – Associate Research Fellow with the China Programme at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS)

(Zhang, October 13, 2015; “China-US Climate Change Cooperation: Beyond Energy,” date accessed: 2.20.16, The Diplomat, http://thediplomat.com/2015/10/china-us-climate-change-cooperation-beyond-energy/)//AP

The remarkable success in Sino-U.S. climate change cooperation can be attributed to a wide arrange of factors, including growing domestic pressures, stable and flourishing non-official exchanges, and a change of attitude towards some of the key climate issues, to name but a few. Nonetheless, the solid foundation which has been laid on bilateral energy cooperation, clean energy in particular, is the key driving factor. However, relying on the energy sector alone is risky, and efforts in the energy sector might not be sufficient to sustain Sino-US climate change cooperation and curb global warming.

The two countries’ commitment on clean energy should not be taken for granted. In the U.S., the Obama administration certainly has put curbing fossil fuels top of its policy agenda and has made very real efforts to enact policies and regulations to achieve these goals. However, whether those measures can survive political opposition remains uncertain. The 2016 presidential election could be a critical moment in the trajectory of U.S. climate policy. Moreover, the shale gas revolution not only enables the U.S. to achieve energy self-sufficiency, it may also make America the world’s top exporter of fossil energies. This means energy security concerns might no longer be the top policy issue for the United States, which could then weaken the government’s commitment towards developing clean energies.

### FDI Links

#### Massive opposition to the plan – security and intelligence concerns

Segal ‘4 – Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow for China Studies and Director of the Digital and Cyberspace Policy Program,

(Adam, Summer 2004, "Practical Engagement: Drawing a Fine Line for U.S.-China Trade," Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/china/practical-engagement-drawing-fine-line-us-china-trade/p7063)//AP

Technologically obsolete, geographically isolated, and dominated by moribund state-owned enterprises, China’s military S&T system traditionally has lagged behind the technology used by the country’s commercial producers. An innovative civilian sector in China might change this imbalance, how-ever, by creating what James Mulvenon has called the “digital triangle”— close cooperation among government research and development (R&D) institutes, the military, and commercial enterprises involved in information technology (IT)—to develop advanced technologies for civilian and military use.8 Seeking access to China’s domestic market, U.S. firms often cooperate with Chinese producers and, as a result, may transfer technologies or management skills that could improve China’s capacity to coordinate complex military systems. Finally, opponents of engagement with China fear that technology transfers and foreign direct investment might create a second-order security problem: the threat of technological dependence on China (or on manufacturers located in China). In the case of semiconductors, for example, the fear is that the location of manufacturing facilities in China might prevent the U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. intelligence agencies from securing “first access and assured access to secure advanced chip-making capability.”9

### Korea Links

#### Troop reduction in Korea is a political pitfall – plan is spun as a security risk

**Swaine 15** [Michael - Swaine is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and one of the most prominent American analysts in Chinese security studies. “Beyond American Predominance in the Western Pacific: The Need for a Stable U.S.-China Balance of Power”, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 4/20/2015, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2015/04/20/beyond-american-predominance-in-western-pacific-need-for-stable-u.s.-china-balance-of-power/i7gi>] bjs

On the U.S. side, first and foremost is the general refusal of most if not all U.S. decision makers and officials to contemplate an alternative to U.S. military predominance in this vital region. Such maritime predominance has arguably served Washington and most of the region well for many decades, and it accords with the deep-seated notion of American exceptionalism, which prescribes a dominant U.S. leadership role throughout the world. In addition, the short-term perspective, natural inertia, and risk avoidance of bureaucrats and policy communities in Washington (and elsewhere) militate against major shifts in policy and approach, especially in the absence of an urgent and palpable need for change. Indeed, it is extremely difficult for any major power, much less a superpower, to begin a fundamental strategic shift in anticipation of diminished relative capabilities before that diminishment fully reveals itself. In the Western Pacific in particular, with regard to both U.S. ISR activities along the Chinese coast and the larger U.S. military presence within the first island chain, the United States Navy and many U.S. decisionmakers are wedded to the notion that American power (and in particular naval power) must brook no limitation in areas beyond a nation’s 12-nautical-mile territorial waters and airspace. This derives in part from the belief that any constraints on U.S. naval operations will lead to a cascade of coastal states challenging the principle of U.S. maritime freedom of action and to possible reductions in the level of resources and the scope of operations available to support U.S. naval power. Moreover, the specific U.S. desire to maintain a strong naval presence along China’s maritime periphery reflects a perceived need to acquire more accurate intelligence regarding Beijing’s growing offshore air and naval capabilities. Such a presence is also viewed as essential to sustaining U.S. credibility with Asian allies such as Japan and the Philippines, and to the maintenance of deterrent capabilities against a possible Chinese attack on Taiwan. This combination of service interests, intelligence needs, and perceived security requirements reinforces the general U.S. bias in favor of continued maritime predominance. However, an inevitable Chinese refusal to accept that predominance over the long term will be expressed first and foremost in opposition to the past level of U.S. naval activities along the Chinese coastline, that is, within China’s EEZ at the very least, and possibly within the entire first island chain. Second, and closely related to the prior point, U.S. decisionmakers are extremely loath to contemplate significant adjustments in the current status of the Korean Peninsula and Taiwan. From the U.S. perspective, any movement toward a reduction in or even a significant modification of the U.S. security commitment to these two actors (a U.S military ally and a de facto U.S. protectorate, respectively) could result in either moving to acquire nuclear arms, and/or threats or attacks from North Korea or China. In addition, Japan might react to such movement by questioning Washington’s basic security commitment to Tokyo, which could result in a break in the U.S.-Japan alliance and/or Japanese acquisition of nuclear arms. These concerns are real, if no doubt exaggerated by some in Tokyo or Taipei in order to justify maintenance of the existing U.S. relationship, and in some cases to avoid undertaking costly defense improvements of their own

#### Plan tanks political capital – South Korea has significant political influence

**Urquhart 15** [Craig - --- Ex-soldier, lawyer, OneFreeKorea blogger, helped draft sanctions legislation, denounced by North Korean state media on May Day. “Craig Urquhart: Withdraw U.S. soldiers from Korea”, One Free Korea, April 22, 2015, <http://freekorea.us/2015/04/22/craig-urquhart-withdraw-u-s-soldiers-from-korea/>] bjs

If you’ve been watching events closely enough, however, there are clear signs that some key policymakers would like to reduce or withdraw USFK. For example, last October, at a news conference in Berlin, Secretary of State John Kerry said that the U.S. was “prepared to reduce its military presence in Asia if North Korea rejoins nuclear negotiations and follows through on its denuclearization commitment.” Kerry’s comment drew swift and hard push-back from the South Korean Foreign Minister, Yun Byung-se. Yun “attempted to dilute” Kerry’s comments by saying,“The reduction of the U.S. Forces Korea is an issue that can be discussed in the distant future when the North’s denuclearization is being actualized.” Yun likely has complete confidence that this condition precedent would never come to pass, but it’s less clear that Kerry grasps this. Even so, after Yun talked to Kerry, Kerry was forced to backpedal: It is too premature to talk about reducing American forces in the Korean Peninsula without “authentic and credible” negotiations with Pyongyang about ending its nuclear program, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said on Friday. Kerry said the United States was willing to restart denuclearization talks with North Korea although he emphasized “there is no value in talks just for the sake of talks.” [….] “The mere entering into talks is not an invitation to take any actions regarding troops or anything else,” Kerry said after meeting with South Korean Foreign Minister Yun Byung-se. “If anything, it would be way too premature to have any thought or even discussion of such thing.” [Reuters] Behind the scenes, Republican and Democratic administrations have been trying to extricate U.S. forces from Korea since the great wave of anti-Americanism of 2003. Kerry’s exchange with Yun came shortly after the Pentagon had agreed to an indefinite pause on the OPCON transfer. The following month, however, the Pentagon decided to withdraw and deactivate the 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team of the Second Infantry Division from Korea, a/k/a the Iron Brigade, which had been posted in Korea since 1965. To keep the force numbers at the same level on paper,“similarly sized, fully trained units would be rotated into South Korea for nine-month tours,” although this move would clearly give the U.S. more flexibility to refrain from entering a renewed conflict in Korea. Kerry’s speedy retreat (from withdrawal!) is understandable to anyone who knows the power of South Korea’s influence machine in Washington. Through the Korea Foundation and other groups, it gives generously to a number of influential think tanks here, which in turn are funded by South Korea’s corporate conglomerates. Ordinarily, rational people don’t throw money at goals that don’t serve their interests. Obviously, those donors believe that it serves their interests to sustain the status quo. Whether that serves America’s interests is an entirely different question. Frankly, I doubt that it serves the interests of ordinary South Koreans, much less the interests of the North Korean people. This suggests a second reason for reducing USFK’s presence — that the scale of this alliance, and the influence machine it has spawned, inhibits the emergence of a more clear-eyed approach to North Korea.

#### Troop reduction in Asia is politically impossible – widespread view that it is against US interests

**Swaine 15** [Michael - Swaine is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and one of the most prominent American analysts in Chinese security studies. “Beyond American Predominance in the Western Pacific: The Need for a Stable U.S.-China Balance of Power”, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 4/20/2015, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2015/04/20/beyond-american-predominance-in-western-pacific-need-for-stable-u.s.-china-balance-of-power/i7gi>] bjs

On the U.S. side, for an arguably growing number of American and some foreign observers, Beijing’s de facto challenge to American predominance in the Western Pacific is a mere prelude to a larger effort to eject the United States from Asia and eventually replace it as the regional (and for some, global) superpower. Chinese support for a multipolar, balance-of-power system is thus seen as a mere tactical feint designed to undermine U.S. power while Beijing prepares to become the new hegemon. Indeed, for such observers, Beijing’s greater assertiveness regarding maritime territorial disputes as well as U.S. and Japanese intelligence and surveillance activities along its coastline constitute strategic gambits designed to “test” U.S. and allied resolve and ultimately to create “no-go” zones essential for the establishment of Chinese control over the Western Pacific. Such an outcome would directly threaten both U.S. and allied interests in an open, secure, and peaceful Asia-Pacific region. Given this supposedly unambiguous threat, for these observers, the only logical course of action for the United States is to decisively disabuse Beijing of its aspirations by enhancing American predominance and thereby increasing, rather than reducing, Chinese vulnerability in the Western Pacific. This view is held not only by scholars and policy analysts outside Washington. It is also fairly common among U.S. government officials, both civilian and military. It offers a black-and-white, Manichean-type solution to a supposedly clear-cut threat, and one that is extremely appealing to those many U.S. policymakers and analysts convinced of the huge merits (and necessity) of continued American predominance in maritime Asia. In fact, even for those who reject the notion that Beijing is working to dislodge the United States from the region, predominance remains the best insurance against an uncertain future, for the reasons outlined above. While the type of U.S. predominance in Asia espoused by most U.S. observers can vary somewhat, depending in part on how one views China’s capabilities and intentions, the bottom line for virtually all such individuals is the need for a clear U.S. ability to prevail in any important military-political contingency involving China. Moreover, this view is reinforced, in their minds, by the notion that America’s allies and friends also supposedly desire and require continued U.S. maritime predominance.

#### Plan generates massive GOP opposition

Taylor ‘13 – National Security Team Leader at The Washington Times

(Guy, “Bipartisan unity on North Korea: Republicans praise Obama’s handling of threat,” 4/7/13, date accessed: 6.22.16, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/apr/7/bipartisan-unity-n-korea-republicans-praise-obamas/)//AP

President Obama won rare foreign policy praise from Republicans for his administration’s handling of the [North Korea](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/north-korea/) crisis, as [China](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/china/) signaled a possible readiness to play a more active role in pressuring Pyongyang away from provoking a military conflict. Two influential Republicans commended the White House on separate news talk shows [Sunday](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/sunday/) for striking an effective balance by allowing senior Cabinet members to issue cautionary remarks in response to [North Korea](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/north-korea/), while also strategically adjusting the U.S. military posture in the region. “This administration’s acted responsibly,” said Sen. Lindsey Graham, who often is an outspoken critic of the administration’s foreign policy. Appearing on [NBC](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/nbc/)’s [“Meet the Press,”](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/meet-the-press/) the South Carolina Republican lauded the White House’s recent decisions to publicize images of American B-2 bombers in the region while also delaying a previously scheduled intercontinental missile test out of concerns it might further escalate tensions with [North Korea](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/north-korea/). A senior U.S. defense official said Sunday the long-planned test at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California had been delayed, according to The Associated Press. Mr. Graham also said he was “glad we’re telling our allies in South Korea and Japan: ‘We literally have your back.’”

### MES Links

#### Automatic and unconditional provision of MES triggers backlash from lobbies, Congress and the public

Deynoot 16 – MA International Conflict and Security @ Kent; Consultant, EU Public Affairs @ Weber-Shandick (Christiaan, “Towards China’s Market Economy Status,” April, http://webershandwick.be/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Weber-Shandwick-Report-Towards-China-Market-Economy-Status\_April-2016.pdf)//BB

Politics remains the ultimate test in this global debate. In international trade, the politics are primarily local, as any decision or agreement must be sold to national audiences. This is particularly relevant in the West in light of electoral cycles, but the impact of public opinion should not be downplayed in China. Indeed, Beijing’s political legitimacy rests on driving economic performance and securing global recognition. For Beijing, much rests on the fundamental belief that China must return to its rightful place in the global economy: • China’s leaders attach political significance to MES, seeing it as a status symbol vis-à-vis other powers, particularly developed economies such as the U.S. and the EU. • Beijing considers it an automatic right after the 15-year transitional period. Being denied MES would be perceived as unjust since Russia and the Ukraine were granted MES in 2002 and 2006 respectively, even though they arguably did not constitute market economies. • China has especially high expectations vis-à- vis the EU. When China applied for WTO membership, the EU was, albeit after long negotiations, the first to extend its endorsement. In the U.S., the Obama administration is in its final year in office and a breakdown in bilateral relations with China would be an undesirable legacy. Washington must therefore strike a delicate balance in its bilateral economic discussions with China: • The U.S. is urging Beijing to implement structural reforms which would help the country transition from an export-led to a consumption-led economy, which it believes would rebalance the trade deficit. On the other hand, the administration is under pressure from companies, trade groups and unions not to weaken its trade defence instruments and to nudge China away from interventionist policies. The U.S. aluminium and textile sectors have allied with the steel industry to oppose China MES. • This is an election year for both the Presidency and Congress, one in which many voters are worried about the impact of trade on their jobs and communities. U.S. competitiveness, including the issue of U.S.-China commercial ties, is a topic of much debate, and the majority of candidates on both ends of the political spectrum broadly oppose any automatic treatment of China as a market economy.

#### The plan requires political capital for legislative change

Deynoot 16 – MA International Conflict and Security @ Kent; Consultant, EU Public Affairs @ Weber-Shandick (Christiaan, “Towards China’s Market Economy Status,” April, http://webershandwick.be/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Weber-Shandwick-Report-Towards-China-Market-Economy-Status\_April-2016.pdf)//BB

The uniqueness of this situation means that the possible outcomes are varied. The European Commission’s public consultation has outlined the following possibilities: 1. Business as usual: The EU and the U.S. stick to their current approach. China could then take them to the WTO Dispute Settlement Body to challenge the validity of their interpretation. Reaching a verdict would be a lengthy process, buying the EU and U.S. time to refine their trade defence instruments. This could inject new momentum into a reform proposal on EU Trade Defence Instruments, which has been under discussion by EU Member States since 2013. 2. Giving in: This would involve removing China from the list of non-market economies in EU/U.S. anti-dumping legislation, requiring a legislative proposal to amend domestic law. However, the potential effect of lowering trade defences on certain industries and jobs will make such a legislative change politically difficult to sell in those jurisdictions.

#### The plan triggers Congressional backlash---election year magnifies the link

Henry 16 – MA @ JHU in political communication (Stephanie, “China Takes Center Stage at US Government Overcapacity Hearings,” US China Business Council, https://www.uschina.org/washington-update/china-takes-center-stage-us-government-overcapacity-hearings)//BB

Commerce Secretary Penny Pritzker chaired the second day’s hearing on April 13, saying “non-market economic behavior has resulted in massive overproduction and overcapacity,” dampening competition and global production. The reference to “non-market economic behavior” is notable, given that the US will decide this year whether it will stop treating China as a non-market economy (NME) in dumping cases, as stipulated in China’s WTO accession protocol. If the United States stops using NME methodology on products from China, tariffs levied on “dumped” goods from China in US trade remedy cases would likely be reduced.

In 2016 – an election year in the US – China’s status under US trade remedies rules has become a high profile issue among some members of Congress and the administration. Members of Congress participating at the hearings included House Ways and Means Committee Ranking Member Sandy Levin (D-MI), who in his remarks said that China is not a market economy. Senator Rob Portman (R-OH) echoed Levin’s position during the hearing, saying “China could avoid effective enforcement of our antidumping laws” if the Administration begins treating China as a market economy. Other members present at the hearings included Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH), Sen. Tim Ryan (D-OH, 13), Rep. Rick Nolan (D-MN, 8), and Rep. Mike Bost (R-IL, 12).

Prior to the hearing, a bipartisan group of 22 Senators, including Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Orrin Hatch (R-UT) and Ranking Member Ron Wyden (D-OR), sent a letter to the administration expressing their concern on overcapacity issues. The letter said, “Certain Chinese industrial policies to encourage capacity expansion, including through subsidies and other market distorting-measures, were an important contributor” to global steel growth. The letter called on the administration to “take all appropriate action to address global overcapacity and related challenges…[including]…through multilateral and bilateral fora” and through enforcing the recently enacted Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 and the American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act.

### L T/MES

#### Backlash to MES wrecks US-China economic ties

Scissors 16 – fellow @ AEI (Derek, “Fixing US-China Trade and Investment,” https://www.aei.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/China-US.pdf)//BB

3. Do not grant market economy status. The WTO accession agreement indicates China should be treated as a market economy for the purposes of American trade starting in late 2016. Whatever the legal considerations, the PRC does not have a market economy or anything close to it. Its own statements about the state sector make that clear. Pretending Beijing has implemented the necessary reforms would undermine American domestic political support for economic engagement with China and can only make justified attempts to address noncommercial Chinese behavior less effective and more complicated. It would be doubling down on a flawed WTO decision.

### MES t/o TPP

#### Plan costs Obama TPP

Deynoot 16 – MA International Conflict and Security @ Kent; Consultant, EU Public Affairs @ Weber-Shandick (Christiaan, “Towards China’s Market Economy Status,” April, http://webershandwick.be/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Weber-Shandwick-Report-Towards-China-Market-Economy-Status\_April-2016.pdf)//BB

In the long-term, recognising China as a market economy could have implications for other international negotiations and China’s future geopolitical position: • Once treated as a market economy, China will have a stronger and more equal position within other trade-related negotiations. Being recognised as a market economy is therefore an important element of its global outreach strategy, and Beijing firmly believes that this is just a matter of time. • In the U.S., changing how China is treated in anti-dumping proceedings could cost the Obama administration the Congressional support it needs to ratify the Trans-Pacific Partnership deal. For the EU, which is already struggling to gain popular support for its trade negotiations with the U.S., further antagonising some Member States and Members of the European Parliament by recognising China as a market economy could backfire.

### Military Cooperation Links

#### Political opposition means the plan costs PC and the link turns the case

Goldstein ’15 – associate professor in the Strategic Research Department at the US Naval War College (NWC)

(Lyle J., 2015, Meeting China Halfway, Georgetown University Press, Project Muse, date accessed: 6.24.16, Page 209-210 of Chapter 8, https://muse.jhu.edu/book/39628)//AP

Washington’s move 1 on the Korean Peninsula: The United States should propose a military history project bringing together the Chinese and US militaries to jointly study the Korean War (figure 8.1). The last time that China and the United States engaged in armed hostilities was during the Korean War. This conflict, albeit occurring in a unique historical context, has much to teach current and future US and Chinese military leaders. Most critically, the two powers squared off in Korea inadvertently in a military conflict that neither sought directly. The costs were immense on both sides, moreover, and instructively, there was no decisive winner; the contest of two titans was fought to a draw. The process of joint study by a diverse group of scholars, veterans, policy experts, and most of all active-duty senior military leadership would have numerous benefits, not least some due reflection regarding misperception, escalation, and the role of third parties in drawing the great powers into disputes. Military exchanges between the United States and China are frequently symbolic and stilted—and almost uniformly lacking in substance. Insofar as most military professionals take a deep interest in both military history and tactical proficiency, the larger group would have much to discuss—and need not be weighed down by contemporary political issues. The project might adopt an annual pattern of a one-week “staff ride” that visited one or two Korean battlefields on an annual basis and that was attended ideally by the US senior military official in South Korea and the Chinese commander of the Shenyang Military Region. The proposal would undoubtedly benefit from the trend in Chinese historical studies toward much greater objectivity and correspondingly less ideology. Such a creative attempt by Washington to engage with Beijing on the Korean security issue could initiate the long-overdue process of active US-China strategic cooperation on the peninsula, as well as benefiting the US-China security relationship more broadly.

#### Congress hates military exchanges – opposition undermines effective engagement

Quirk ’15 – Lieutenant (junior grade), is a U.S. Navy Surface Warfare Officer stationed in Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. He is also a Young Leader and non-resident WSD-Handa Fellow with the Pacific Forum CSIS. He previously lived in Beijing, China.

(Sean P., November 09, 2015, “Reconciling China’s PLAN: Strategic Intervention, Tactical Engagement,” date accessed: 6.20.16, http://thediplomat.com/2015/11/reconciling-chinas-plan-strategic-intervention-with-tactical-engagement/)//AP

A new era of U.S.-China mil-to-mil exchange should imitate diplomatic meetings as regular, recurring events. Military exchanges between the two countries are currently episodic and highly vulnerable to political and congressional cancellation. The result? The bulk of military unit “exchanges” between the two navies consist of adversarial shadowing of warships and unsafe military air interceptions – antagonistic events that should not form the foundation of our navies’ interactions. When official exchanges do occur, they are beneficial but often heavily scripted and cursory. Port visits by U.S. warships to Hong Kong and mainland China are the most common means of unit-level naval exchange. Yet political sensitivities stymie engagement of much value-added trust, replacing substance with formality. Even the cultural exchanges that are common in all U.S. port visits are uncommon with port calls in China; activities such as crew-to-crew receptions, community service, and athletic games between U.S. and Chinese forces do occur but are far too rare for the world’s two biggest powers.

#### Plan sparks massive opposition –security concerns

Lieberthal and Jisi ’12 – a senior fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at Brookings; Dean of the School of International Studies at Peking University.

(Kenneth and Wang, John L. Thornton China Center Monograph Series • Number 4 • March 2012; date accessed: 6.20.16, “Addressing U.S.-China Strategic Distrust,” date accessed: 6.20.16, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2012/3/30-us-china-lieberthal/0330\_china\_lieberthal.pdf)//AP

Recent developments have increased suspicions among relevant American agencies. The U.S. military sees the PLA apparently prioritizing development of weapons systems particularly targeted at American platforms, and it worries about lack of transparency in China’s military plans and doctrines. The scope and persistence of China-based cyber attacks against U.S. government, military, and private sector targets has alarmed American officials in charge of cyber efforts and raised very serious concerns about Chinese norms and intentions. And U.S. intelligence officials see increased evidence of zero-sum thinking in Beijing regarding the U.S. and also increased Chinese espionage efforts in the United States.

#### Engagement over SCS costs PC – politicians oppose appeasement

Corr and Tacujan ‘13 – both Ph.D.s

(Anders S. and Priscilla A., "Chinese Political and Economic Influence in the Philippines: Implications for Alliances and the South China Sea Dispute," Journal of Political Risk, Vol. 1, No. 3, July 2013; date of access: 6.20.16, http://www.jpolrisk.com/chinese-political-and-economic-influence-in-the-philippines-implications-for-alliances-and-the-south-china-sea-dispute/)//AP

Using the United States as a strategic counterweight against China, however, entails much less risk to sovereignty than does appeasement. Anti-foreign sentiment is driving some Philippine officials to adopt a hard stance against the United States presence even though America’s security interests do not conflict with the Philippines’ own security interests.  The United States government and its allies would like to contain China’s militaristic and irregular South China Sea expansion for long-term strategic reasons, rather than for the short-term territorial aggrandizement that motivates China. The United States does not want appeasement of China in the South China Sea to embolden the country with respect to South Korea, Taiwan and Japan. Any attempt by China to encroach on the territory, energy resources, fishing waters, or transportation lanes of these allies could easily lead to a Pacific war that would be costly to the United States in lives and wealth.

### Repeal Wolf Links

#### Repealing the Wolf Amendment is massively unpopular-Chinese aggression, no constituency, and House resistance

Villasanta 3/25

Arthur Villasanta 3/25, Writer for the Philippine Daily Inquirer, 3/25/2016, Chinatopix, “NASA’s Bolden Makes Brave but Pointless Appeal for U.S.-China Space Cooperation”, http://www.chinatopix.com/articles/88677/20160525/nasa-s-bolden-makes-brave-pointless-appeal-u-china-space.htm

The 112th United States Congress in November 2011 banned NASA from engaging in bilateral agreements and coordination with China, a ban enforced under Public Law 112-55, Sec. 539. The specific provision states: "None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) or the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by a law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act. "The limitation in subsection (a) shall also apply to any funds used to effectuate the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by NASA. "The limitations described in subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to activities which NASA or OSTP have certified pose no risk of resulting in the transfer of technology, data, or other information with national security or economic security implications to China or a Chinese-owned company." Public Law 112-55 is otherwise known as the ''Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012." The probability of the U.S. Congress enacting a new law to overturn Public Law 112-55, Sec. 539 is remote considering China's perceived hostility towards the U.S. in the South China Sea, the beefing-up of its military and the absence of lawmakers willing to go to bat for China. The right wing Republican Party is patently hostile towards China and its members control the committee in the House of Representatives responsible for NASA appropriations. The man who chairs the House of Representatives appropriations subpanel that oversees NASA, John Culberson (R-TX), is a space geek who in 2010 urged President Barack Obama not to allow further contact between NASA and the China National Space Administration (CNSA). "I have grave concerns about the nature and goals of China's space program and strongly oppose any cooperation between NASA and CNSA's human space flight programs without Congressional authorization," he said in a letter to Obama. Bolden said he doesn't not expect the ban to be lifted during his tenure that ends with that of Obama's.

#### Obama empirically gets the blame – security hawks will backlash

Smith 15

Marcia Smith 15, Founder and editor of SpacePolicyOnline.com and President of Space and Technology Policy Group, 10/26/2015, SpacePolicyOnline, “Culberson Will "Vigorously Enforce" Restrictions on NASA-China Relationship – UPDATED”, http://www.spacepolicyonline.com/news/culberson-will-vigorously-enforce-restrictions-on-nasa-china-relationship

Rep. John Culberson (R-TX) said today that NASA did not fully inform Congress about the recent State Department-led meeting in Beijing on bilateral U.S.-China civil space cooperation as required by law. He stressed that he plans to "vigorously enforce" the law, which requires NASA to notify Congress in advance of such meetings that technology transfer, for example, will not occur. In a statement to SpacePolicyOnline.com, Culberson said: “NASA has failed to provide the committee with details on the depth and scope of the meetings hosted by the Department of State. China’s Space program is owned and controlled entirely by the People’s Liberation Army and the Chinese government have proven to be the world’s most aggressive in cyber espionage. I intend to vigorously enforce the longstanding prohibitions designed to protect America’s space program.” Culberson chairs the House Appropriations Commerce-Justice-Science (CJS) subcommittee, which funds NASA. His predecessor, former Rep. Frank Wolf (R-VA), led the effort to include language in NASA's appropriations bills prohibiting NASA or the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) from spending any funds related to bilateral space cooperation with China unless certain certifications are made to Congress in advance. Culberson echoes Wolf's views and continues the precedent. In June, the State Department announced the initiation of a U.S.-China Civil Space Dialogue with the first meeting scheduled to take place before the end of October. Reaction to the announcement was muted despite the controversy. The first meeting took place in Beijing last month and another is planned in 2016. NASA confirmed that it participated in the Beijing meeting. Section 532 of the FY2015 appropriations law (P.L. 113-235) that funds NASA states that NASA may not spend any funds to "develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company unless such activities are specifically authorized by law enacted after the date of enactment of this Act." Those limitations do not apply if "no later than 30 days prior to the activity in question," NASA certifies that the activity poses no risk of the transfer of "technology, data, or other information with national security or economic security implications" and does not "involve knowing interactions with officials who have been determined by the United States to have direct involvement with violations of human rights." Any such certification "shall include a description of the purpose of the activity, its agenda, its major participants, and its location and timing." In an emailed statement to SpacePolicyOnline.com on October 27, NASA responded to Culberson's comments as follows: “All discussions under the U.S.-China Civil Space Cooperation Dialogue, including NASA's participation, were conducted in full accordance with U.S. law and regulations.” SpacePolicyOnline.com requested a copy of any correspondence NASA might have sent to Congress in fulfillment of the legal obligations, but nothing was provided. In a related development, Culberson issued a press release last week following the indictment of two NASA supervisors as a result of the Bo Jiang espionage case. He said the indictment is "further proof of the widespread negligence at NASA and throughout the Obama Administration when it comes to protecting U.S. intellectual property and sensitive information."

#### Human rights concerns ensure backlash

Walker 15

Alissa Walker 15, Urbanism editor at Gizmodo, 6/19/2015, “What's Stopping Us from Building Cities in Space? No, It's Not Tech.”, http://gizmodo.com/whats-stopping-us-from-building-cities-in-space-no-it-1711985320

Thanks to a 2011 Congressional act that bars the US from collaborating with China’s space program, NASA is not allowed to work directly with the most quickly accelerating efforts to get humans into space. This is a huge problem. “There are only two places that are going into space,” says Waldman, referring to current crewed missions by Russia and China. “We’re not one of them, and we’re not in collaboration with the other one of them.” Even more frustrating is the fact that certain politicians who are otherwise zealous about human spaceflight are voicing support for the China ban. Take Representative John Culberson, a Texas Republican who has been evangelistic about a mission to Europa. Since this Jupiter moon is thought to have liquid water and a climate which might support life, it’s currently second in priority in the roadmap, and NASA will soon need to make a critical decision about funding it. (Update: As of today, it’s moving forward.) But he has also been vocal about not working with the Chinese. Many other political figures point to China’s human rights violations as a reason not to align with the country. Yet they seem to overlook the many human rights concerns when it comes to collaborating with Russia.

### Space Cooperation Links

Plan Costs PC – Security concerns mean it’s a long policy battle

Dickerson 15

Kelly Dickerson 15, Science reporter at Tech Insider covering space and physics, 10/19/2015, Tech Insider, “Here's why NASA won't work with China to explore space”, http://www.techinsider.io/nasa-china-collaboration-illegal-2015-10

Tyson is correct to think this strategy would never work, at least not today. The reason is because, in 2011, Congress passed a spending bill that expressly forbids NASA from working with China, citing a high risk of espionage. What's more, it doesn't sound like the attitudes of US lawmakers toward the People's Republic of China are changing anytime soon. A 2015 report from the University of California called "China Dream, Space Dream" concludes that: "China's efforts to use its space program to transform itself into a military, economic, and technological power may come at the expense of U.S. leadership and has serious implications for U.S. interests." It will take a big policy shift to change that sentiment and foster collaboration between NASA and the China National Space Administration (CNSA). One of the biggest collaborative projects in which NASA is involved is the International Space Station (ISS). It's a space station built and maintained by the United States, Russia, Europe, Japan, and Canada. China, however, is banned from involvement in the ISS, thanks to US lawmakers. But CNSA seems to be doing just fine on its own. Since its founding in 1993, the Chinese space agency has launched 10 people and a small space station into orbit, among other missions. China's successes in space have impressed NASA enough to broach the topic of collaboration several times at the White House. But according to space policy expert John Logsdon, getting the US to work together with China on spaceward missions will take a long policy battle. "The first step is the White House working with congressional leadership to get current, unwise restrictions on such cooperation revoked," Logsdon told Space.com. "Then, the United States can invite China to work together with the United States and other spacefaring countries on a wide variety of space activities and, most dramatically, human spaceflight." NASA could have much to gain in the future in working with China. China became the third country ever to successfully launch humans into space, behind Russia and the US, and it's made much progress since. Two years ago, CNSA landed a small telescope on the moon, which is still up there taking crystal-clear images of the cosmos (because Earth's dirty atmosphere isn't in the way). The agency also operates its own space lab called Tiangong 1, is testing powerful new rockets, and has ambitious plans to land more probes on the moon and perhaps a colony there one day. If CNSA's progress in space exploration and tech development isn't a compelling enough reason to work with China, then NASA's stunted budget offers another. More international collaboration could only be positive for a space agency that has faced budget cut after budget cut. President John F. Kennedy committed to a moon landing by the end of the 1960s, then Nixon took the helm and slammed on the brakes after a handful of crewed lunar missions. As Logsdon writes in an article for NASA: "Nixon rejected NASA's ambitious post-Apollo plans, which included developing a series of large space stations, continued missions to the moon, and an initial mission to Mars in the 1980s," Logsdon writes. "By the time Nixon left the White House, the NASA budget had fallen from its peak of almost 4% of the total federal budget to less than 1%." Some argue that we would already have sent humans to Mars if NASA had kept its momentum. More collaboration could help get NASA back on track. NASA administrator Charles Bolden event wrote in a recent blog post that he thinks more collaboration will help get us get boots on Mars A Journey such as this is something that no one person, crew, or Agency can undertake alone. [...] A mission of this magnitude is made stronger with international partnership - the sort of spirit and cooperation that is demonstrated so vividly by the tens of thousands of people across 15 countries who have been involved in the development and operation of the International Space Station. In fact, NASA just announced a partnership with the Israel Space Agency that will allow the two agencies to conduct joint missions and share research facilities. I personally think it would be great to see a similar agreement with China some day soon - especially since the nation announced it's seeking international partners to help build another space station in the 2020s (and the station sounds really cool). But again, current US law forbids NASA from helping out or getting involved at all. Russia will only support the $100 billion space station until 2024, and that's a huge problem because, right now, NASA relies on Russia's rockets to get its astronauts into space. It's unclear what NASA will do once Russia pulls out. Working with China and other nations to build a bigger and better space station would be a great option. Instead of two space stations, we could have one truly international station with the most brilliant scientists around the world working together. That kind of collaboration would speed up tech development; instead of space stations just copying each other's rockets and space probes, we could start working together to advance technology at a much faster pace than we are right now. We'll need a new generation of space tech if we ever hope to get to Mars. It already seems like the two agencies do want to collaborate, since discussion of that possibility has reached the White House several times. US scientists have also openly criticized policy makers in the past for preventing Chinese scientists from attending space conferences. It seems like politics shouldn't get in the way of pure scientific pursuit, but the reality is US lawmakers won't allow collaboration with China because they are worried about national security and protecting state secrets. But who knows, if the two space agencies started working together, it might open up enough lines of communication between the US and China for the two nations to defrost their icy relationship. In the meantime China will continue to expand its space exploration efforts. Unless a big policy shift happens, NASA might have to sit on the sidelines while an incredible new chapter of space exploration begins.

#### Space cooperation saps PC – Host of security concerns preclude engagement

Weibin 14

Zhao Weibin 14, Research Fellow for the Center on China-America Defense Relations at the PLA Academy of Military Science, 7/9/2014, Chinafocus, “Sino-US Competition and Cooperation in Outer Space”, http://www.chinausfocus.com/foreign-policy/sino-us-competition-and-cooperation-in-outer-space/

Major obstacles to Sino-U.S. space cooperation are U.S. security concerns and political resistance. With a huge generation gap in space capabilities, Americans may gain much less than the Chinese and it is understandable that the U.S. side is reluctant to cooperate and share. In addition, discrepancies on maritime disputes, cyber issues, and others concerns also hinder space cooperation between China and the U.S.. The removal of zero-sum thinking and political shackles, the integration of China into international efforts of space exploration, and the establishment of institutional bilateral space cooperation mechanisms would be effective approaches to Sino-U.S. space cooperation. Against the backdrop of building a new model for major power relations and in the face of common space security threats, China and the U.S. should overcome the resistance, build a framework for broad space cooperation, and try to overwhelm the impulse of confrontation by the impetus of cooperation.

### Space ISS Links

#### **Plan saps PC – Congress is unwilling to partner with China over ISS**

Hunt and Mackenzie 15

Katie Hunt and David Mackenzie 15, Senior digital producer for CNN International, award-winning international correspondent for CNN, May 2015, CNN, “China The next space superpower?, http://www.cnn.com/interactive/2015/05/world/china-space/

U.S. space technology is still "hands down the best in the world," says Joan Johnson-Freese, a professor at the U.S. Naval War College, but she says the U.S. lacks the political will to fund an ambitious manned spaceflight program, China's is the pride of the nation. "It would cost the US $140 billion for a true moon and Mars exploration mission but sticker shock would kill it instantly," she says. "In terms of perception, America has already ceded its leadership in exploration to China." Inside Space City, Commander Nie -- who leads the manned space mission -- is more diplomatic. "The United States and Russia started their programs early. They are the pioneers," he says. "Our space development is not because of some space competition or trying to overtake anyone." But the modern race to the stars is not just about money, it's driven by technological advances and cooperation. The International Space Station (ISS) houses a veritable United Nations in space with 15 countries contributing including the U.S., Russia and Japan. But not China. China's 21 astronauts are locked out of the ISS, largely because of pressure from U.S. legislators. In 2011, Congress banned NASA from working bilaterally with anyone from the Chinese space program on national security concerns. But a recent exhaustive report for the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission says China's improving space capability "has negative sum consequences for U.S. military security." "China is viewed as a foe, it is viewed as a government that seeks to take our intellectual property, national secrets and treasure and thus Congress is not willing to partner with them," says CNN space and aviation analyst Miles O'Brien.

Plan costs PC – debate over ISS cooperation gets shut down every time

Wentz 15

Rachel Wentz 15, Professor of physical anthropology, human osteology and forensic anthropology at Florida State University, 5/31/2015, Science Times, “Chinese Astronauts Hope to Come aboard International Space Station, and End US Ban”, http://www.sciencetimes.com/articles/6823/20150531/chinese-astronauts-hope-to-come-aboard-international-space-station-and-end-us-ban.htm

"As an astronaut, I have a strong desire to fly with astronauts from other countries," said Nie Haisheng, a Chinese astronaut and commander of the Shenzhou 10 mission in an interview with CNN. "I also look forward to going to the International Space Station. But U.S. lawmakers see things differently. In fact, they passed an act barring NASA from any cooperative space ventures with China back in 2011, out of fears for national security. And they don't seem likely to change their mind anytime soon. "Every time it gets mentioned at all anywhere near Congress, it gets shut down immediately," space analyst Miles O'Brien told CNN. "There is tremendous skepticism there about China. It is viewed as a foe, it is viewed as a government that seeks to take our intellectual property -- our national secrets and treasure." China has tried to assuage those fears, advocating for a change in policy through political representatives and the Chinese astronauts themselves. "The Chinese government has always advocated the peaceful use of outer space, it opposes space weaponization and an arms race in outer space. This position will not be changed," Wang Jin, a spokesman for the Ministry of Defense, told CNN. Commander Nie Haisheng put it plainly. "...Space is a family affair, many countries are developing their space programs and China, as a big country, should make our own contributions in this field." And they've done just that. China launched its own manned space program in 1992 and has made steady progress ever since. They put their first man in space in 2003, completed their first spacewalk five years later, and in 2013, Commander Nie and his crew twice docked with the Tiangong-1 space lab, China's scaled-down version of the ISS, completing the country's longest space mission to date.

#### Plan requires wolf amendment repeal

Kohler 15

Hannah Kohler 15, Georgetown Law, J.D, 2015, Georgetown Law Journal vol. 103, 2015, “The Eagle and the Hare: U.S.–Chinese Relations, the Wolf Amendment, and the Future of International Cooperation in Space”, http://georgetownlawjournal.org/files/2015/04/Kohler-TheEagleandtheHare.pdf

At this point, however, it must be considered that Congressman Wolf’s personal interpretation of the statute no longer controls; the plain language of Section 532 does restrict multilateral interaction. The widespread confusion and misapplication of the Amendment between 2011 and 2013 are damning evidence; if the international space community could not parse the wording of the old legislation, it seems unlikely that they will be any less liberal in applying the new, stricter language. The heart of the problem lies in the misapplied focus that Wolf and other members of the House Appropriations Committee have granted to the Amendment. Congressman Wolf, in many of his statements concerning the Amendment, emphasizes the bilateral/multilateral nature of a given activity to determine whether it should be considered prohibited.123 However, this is not the heart of the issue. Although bilateral coordination is unarguably banned in both the 2011 and 2014 versions of the Amendment, the true focus has consistently been on the issue of officialness, not number of parties or even the nature of the activity.

### Space Debris Links

#### Debris cooperation costs PC – Political bickering is SOP

Joan Johnson-Freese 14

Professor of national security at the Naval War College, 3/2/2014, BreakingDefense, “Taking Out The Space Trash; A Model For Space Cooperation”, http://breakingdefense.com/2014/05/taking-out-the-space-trash-a-model-for-space-cooperation/

From the Cold War space race to the Apollo-Soyuz handshake in space, to holding China at arms length from International Space Station involvement, domestic politics have determined the tone and extent of our international space cooperation. That is both disheartening and frightening. Disheartening because space is an inherently international domain which hosts assets providing and transmitting information key to personal, corporate and national well being in a globalized world, and it doesn’t work well without cooperation for the sustainable use of all. Frightening because of the willingness of some politicians to sacrifice space cooperation as a whipping boy for other issues, from personal religious views to disapproval regarding types of government or geostrategic land grabs, or to ignore the need for cooperation altogether. The US is not the only country that politicizes space, with some countries still unwilling to engage in the kind of transparency needed as a prerequisite for space cooperation. But one organization has managed to rise above those politics and work productively toward space sustainability; the Inter-Agency Space Debris Coordination Committee (IADC), set to hold its next meeting May 12 to 15 in Beijing. The question is whether its laudable work on maintaining space as a sustainable environment can clear inevitable future political hurdles. Space agencies have worked together since 1993 as an inter-governmental forum for the coordination of activities related to issues created by man-made and natural space debris, debris with the potential to wreck havoc on or destroy vital space assets. The primary purposes of the IADC are: the exchange of information on space debris research activities between member space agencies: facilitating opportunities for cooperation in space debris research; reviewing the progress of ongoing cooperative activities; and identifying debris mitigation options. With 12 IADC members – the US, China, Russia, Canada, the UK, Italy, France, Germany, India, Japan, Ukraine, and the European Space Agency (ESA) — it might seem as though political bickering would be standard operating procedure, but that has not been the case. A Steering Committee of agency representatives directs, by consensus, what studies the four IADC Working Groups will pursue about measurements (WG1), environment and database (WG2), protection (WG3) and mitigation (WG4). Philosophically, the key to the IADC’s success seems to be that it is, quite simply, in the vested interest in all members. It is in no country’s interest to have assets at risk from space debris. Key to this is releasing materials to the public only when all parties agree – thereby omitting or at least minimizing political potshots – and keeping everyone focused on confidence building through technical studies. Agencies that join must be willing to share data relevant to the Working Groups’ studies and to work with them. One fruit of this cooperation: until recently national governments had few ways to predict when (or where) deorbiting debris – sometimes weighing tons – would hit Earth. These predictions have increased significantly, and are subject to far more confidence. Proving once again that imitation still is the sincerest form of flattery, other space-related groups are now considering the IADC model. An expert group chartered by the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) has been considering how best to track and warn of Near Earth Objects (NEOs) threatening to Earth. Chaired by Sergio Camacho, secretary general of the Mexican-based Regional Center for Space Science and Technology Education for Latin America and the Caribbean, the Action Group has recommended an IADC-like structure to create both a warning network and a Mission Planning Advisory Group. The idea is to, like the IADC, maximize results and minimize politics. Admittedly, minimizing politics is not the same as removing politics. The 2007 IADC meeting was scheduled to be in Beijing, like the next one. That meeting was “postponed until further notice” after Beijing tested an Anti-Satellite (ASAT) weapon against one of its defunct satellites in Low Earth Orbit (LEO). The successful kinetic impact irresponsibly increased the amount of space debris greater than 10 centimeters in diameter by approximately 10 percent, making Beijing’s hosting of the IADC appear more than a bit hypocritical. That ASAT test, however, and the 2009 collision of an operational Iridium satellite and a moribund Russian Kosmos satellite, raised international awareness regarding the space debris issue and the importance of IADC’s work. But the group very deliberately does not involve itself in policy. It produces voluntary guidelines for mitigation practices, shares best practices and data for use by its members. Still, what happens with that data becomes a political issue. In February last year the IADC Steering Committee made a presentation to COPUOS on the Stability of the Future LEO Environment. Since 2005 some IADC members had independently studied the evolution of the far-term LEO satellite population under a variety of scenarios. The study aimed to answer the question: if serious mitigation efforts were undertaken, would the risks of space debris to space assets go down? In 2009, the IADC decided to assess the stability of the LEO space object population and the need to use Active Debris Removal (ADR) to stabilize the future LEO environment. In other words, did the world have to do more than watch carefully and act when needed? The IADC’s Environment and Data Bases working group did the assessment, with the principal participants in the study being Italy, ESA, India, Japan, the US and the UK. Actually getting debris out of orbit — active debris removal — involves significant technical, financial, legal and security issues. Feasible debris removal techniques exist. Germany, Switzerland, the United States and several other countries have approved programs for the development and testing of capabilities that could be used for debris removal. To develop them to the point where they would be operationally useful to change the course of future space sustainability would be expensive, incurring costs that no one country currently seems willing or able to bear. Also, since there are no salvage laws in space, each country owns its own space junk, making it impossible for another country to remove it without permission. Such permissions might be difficult to obtain due to security concerns. After all, grabbing a satellite and redirecting it could be a very useful tool of war. If Country X granted permission to Country Y to remove a piece of their space junk, but country Y “accidently” removed a different asset, that awould undoubtedly result in considerable consternation in Country X. Ideally, any space debris removal program would be an international venture. But here’s the rub: who would trust another country to do the right thing in the right way? The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency’s (DARPA) Phoenix program has shown great progress in the development of capabilities potentially useful in active space debris removal, and at a relatively low-cost. But who thinks the rest of the world would be willing to trust the United States to limit its activities to benignly removing space debris? And trust is the core issue. The IADC has provided the global political community with empirical evidence that action needs to be taken to protect the sustainability of space. If only five large pieces of space junk were removed each year, the odds of a catastrophic event go down significantly. But the politics of fear, inertia and delay will likely prevail. Sadly, the most likely scenario to bring cooperation about: a debris-caused space catastrophe that leads to deaths on Earth. When the IADC meets in May, it should be pleased with its success in working together. Its work is not done though. No one wants fingers pointing when the inevitable disaster occurs, and people ask “who let this happen.” What US politicians need to do is exert global leadership in assuring that the need to act is not ignored in favor of “politics as usual.”

#### Plan requires wolf amendment repeal

Kohler 15

Hannah Kohler 15, Georgetown Law, J.D, 2015, Georgetown Law Journal vol. 103, 2015, “The Eagle and the Hare: U.S.–Chinese Relations, the Wolf Amendment, and the Future of International Cooperation in Space”, http://georgetownlawjournal.org/files/2015/04/Kohler-TheEagleandtheHare.pdf

At this point, however, it must be considered that Congressman Wolf’s personal interpretation of the statute no longer controls; the plain language of Section 532 does restrict multilateral interaction. The widespread confusion and misapplication of the Amendment between 2011 and 2013 are damning evidence; if the international space community could not parse the wording of the old legislation, it seems unlikely that they will be any less liberal in applying the new, stricter language. The heart of the problem lies in the misapplied focus that Wolf and other members of the House Appropriations Committee have granted to the Amendment. Congressman Wolf, in many of his statements concerning the Amendment, emphasizes the bilateral/multilateral nature of a given activity to determine whether it should be considered prohibited.123 However, this is not the heart of the issue. Although bilateral coordination is unarguably banned in both the 2011 and 2014 versions of the Amendment, the true focus has consistently been on the issue of officialness, not number of parties or even the nature of the activity.

### Taiwan Grand Bargain Links

#### Plan is disastrously unpopular – bipartisan opposition, historical context, potential rollback, and spun as appeasement

Easley 16 Assistant Professor in the Division of International Studies at Ewha University and a Research Fellow at the Asian Institute for Policy Studies (Leif-Eric, "Grand bargain or bad idea? US relations with China and Taiwan," International Security, v. 40 #4, Spring 2016, p.178-191)\\BPS

Glaser’s decision not to consider U.S. domestic politics is also problematic. The article focuses on what Glaser thinks are U.S. national interests, rather than on what different political parties, branches of government, businesses, civil society groups, and bureaucratic stakeholders consider U.S. interests. Putting aside the moral failings of disregarding U.S.-Taiwan historical commitments, shared values, and human rights, treating Taiwan as a tradable commodity in great power bargaining is a nonstarter in U.S. politics. Quid pro quo accommodation of China would be resisted in Congress as appeasement or overturned by a subsequent administration. Choosing not to look inside the “black box” of U.S. foreign policy interests, Glaser discounts the bipartisan consensus, upheld over five administrations, to support Taiwan to an extent that maintains regional stability.26

#### Decreasing support for Taiwan costs political capital

**Glaser, 15** - Charles L Glaser is a professor in the Elliott School of International Affairs and the Department of Political Science at George Washington University. He is also a fellow in the Kissinger Institute at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (“A U.S.-China Grand Bargain?” International Security, Vol. 39, No. 4 (Spring 2015), pp. 49–90, doi:10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00199

Many domestic barriers exist to ending the U.S. commitment to Taiwan. Beyond the risks noted above, which will fuel policy-based resistance, the United States’ long-standing commitment to and involvement with Taiwan have created historical and ideological connections. Most concretely, the United States is committed under the Taiwan Relations Act to “consider any effort to determine the future of Taiwan by other than peaceful means . . . of grave concern to the United States” and to “provide Taiwan with arms of a defensive character.”14 Thus, ending the U.S. commitment to Taiwan would require repeal of the Taiwan Relations Act by the U.S. Congress, where repeal would almost certainly face influential opponents. In addition, for many American observers, geopolitical accommodation would be a glaring, concrete admission of American decline that clashed with their image of the United States as the globe’s sole superpower.15

#### The link alone turns the case – Congressional hostility over the debate itself wrecks relations

**Blumenthal, 11 -** Daniel Blumenthal is Director of Asian Studies at the American Enterprise Institute and a frequent contributor to Foreign Policy's Shadow Government blog (“Rethinking U.S. foreign policy towards Taiwan” Foreign Policy, 3/2, <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/03/02/rethinking-u-s-foreign-policy-towards-taiwan/>

Third, there is the matter of U.S. politics, always a significant factor — much to the consternation of so called realists — in U.S. foreign policy. While most Congressmen today do not focus intensely on Taiwan, a debate about the repeal of the Taiwan Relations Act would focus the mind. In all likelihood, all the latent frustrations the American public and their representatives feel toward China — from unfair trade practices, to constant cyber attacks, to human rights abuses — would find expression in a debate about whether or not to repeal a law that has kept the peace and allowed Taiwan to prosper. In short, a debate about abandoning a democratic friend in the face of Chinese pressure would probably bring about the exact opposite of what Glaser intends. Congress would start to focus on all the dangers that China poses and frustrations its presents.

#### Plan costs PC – lawmakers will use Taiwan to portray the president as appeasing China

Hickey ’14 – PhD., Foreign Policy Analyst and Assistant Professor of Political Science at Southwest Missouri State University.

(Dennis Van Vranken, “THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT: A MID-LIFE CRISIS AT 35?” March 2014, date accessed: 6.26.16, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/TRAPolicyBrief.Hickey.pdf)//AP

The TRA was signed 35 years ago. Today, Taiwan does not capture the attention of most lawmakers. Some attribute this phenomenon to the end of the Cold War and the accompanying demise of “anti-communist” sentiment within Congress. Others point to the fracturing of the Taiwan lobby and the highly partisan bickering among those who claim to represent the island’s interests. Still others point to generational change. Taiwan’s strongest congressional supporters have retired or died. Irrespective of the causes, it is clear that Taiwan does not enjoy the same level of interest among lawmakers that it enjoyed in the past.

Summary

The discussion above outlines only several developments that have energized those calling for changes in U.S. policy toward Taiwan. A more complete examination would explore other trends as well. For example, analysts contend that the highly charged partisan atmosphere in Washington has led some lawmakers to champion irresponsible changes in policy. They use Taiwan as a means to attack the president as an “appeaser” who “kowtows” to China.

### Tariffs

#### Obama has already been pressured into increasing tariffs – plan is a flip flop and saps PC

Soergel, 16 (Andrew, staff writer and Economy Reporter at U.S. News, Trump and Obama Agree: Chinese Steel Is a Problem, March 2, 2016, http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2016-03-02/trump-and-obama-agree-chinese-steel-is-a-problem/MS)

The Obama administration may have taken a page out of GOP front-runner Donald Trump's book this week after receiving criticism for months for not being tough enough on international trade standards. The Commerce Department announced Tuesday a wide-ranging slew of tariff increases on certain imported steel products, notably slapping Chinese producers with a preliminary 266 percent tariff after they failed to cooperate in a trade investigation. "In the China investigation, no company responded to Commerce's requests for information," the [department](http://enforcement.trade.gov/download/factsheets/factsheet-multiple-cold-rolled-steel-flat-products-ad-prelim-030116.pdf" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://enforcement.trade.gov/download/factsheets/factsheet-multiple-cold-rolled-steel-flat-products-ad-prelim-030116.pdf) said in a report Tuesday. "Accordingly, all producers/exporters in China received a preliminary dumping margin of 265.79 percent, based on adverse facts available." "Dumping" is defined by the Commerce Department as an instance when "a foreign company sells a product in the United States at less than its fair value." Unfairly or unnaturally low prices on imported goods shake up market shares for domestic producers. Consumers and companies generally try to get the most bang for their buck when making purchases, so the more expensive domestic goods are more likely to be skipped over for the cheaper imports. There's nothing to suggest Trump's success in recent Republican primaries is directly connected to the tariff hikes. Indeed, a handful of American steelmakers [back in June](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-03/u-s-steelmakers-said-to-prepare-trade-case-on-imported-metal" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-03/u-s-steelmakers-said-to-prepare-trade-case-on-imported-metal) filed a complaint with the Commerce Department and International Trade Commission alleging China, Italy, South Korea and Taiwan were selling metals in the U.S. at unfairly low prices. Mexico at the end of 2015 launched its own [investigation](http://www.reuters.com/article/mexico-china-steel-idUSL1N14611Y20151217" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://www.reuters.com/article/mexico-china-steel-idUSL1N14611Y20151217) into certain Chinese-manufactured steel products, and a group of steel associations from the U.S., Mexico, Europe and Brazil in November issued a[statement](https://www.steel.org/~/media/Files/AISI/Press%20Releases/2015/China-MES-Statement-11-3-15.pdf?la=en" \t "_blank" \o "Link: https://www.steel.org/~/media/Files/AISI/Press%20Releases/2015/China-MES-Statement-11-3-15.pdf?la=en) calling on the international community to look closer at Chinese trade practices before relaxing tariffs and treating the nation as a natural market-based economy. "The global steel industry is currently suffering from a crisis of overcapacity, and the Chinese steel industry is the predominant global contributor to this problem," the statement read. "Given the continuing significant role of the Chinese government in many key aspects of the Chinese economy, and especially in its state-owned and controlled steel sector, there can be no question that China remains very much a non-market economy today." But the timing of the Commerce Department's new trade policy is notable. Trump – who has repeatedly called for steeper tariffs, more selective trade deals and more proactive government support of U.S. exporters – currently enjoys a sizable lead over his rival Republican candidates and has built much of his campaign on tearing down what he perceives to be ineffective trade policies supported by the current administration. "China is ripping us on trade. They're devaluing their currency, and they're killing our companies," Trump said during the sixth GOP presidential debate in January. "They can't believe how stupid the American leadership is." That leadership this week, however, announced its intent to fight import dumping from China and a host of international trade partners. Certain Japanese steel imports were hit with a 71.35 percent duty, with Brazil (38.93 percent), the U.K. (28.03 percent), Russia (14.76 percent), India (6.78 percent) and South Korea (4.53 percent) also receiving tariff increases. And certain companies within these nations were hit with even larger duties if they were found to be in particular violation of U.S. standards. Canada was actually the largest importer of steel mill products to the U.S. last year, according to a report released last month by the [Commerce Department](http://hq-web03.ita.doc.gov/License/Surge.nsf/webfiles/SteelMillDevelopments/$file/exec%20summ.pdf?openelement" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://hq-web03.ita.doc.gov/License/Surge.nsf/webfiles/SteelMillDevelopments/$file/exec%20summ.pdf?openelement). Brazil and South Korea were second and third, respectively, while Mexico and Japan were fifth and sixth. Though China ultimately makes up a relatively small share of such trade activity, Chinese steel mill imports jumped 109.6 percent in December. Chinese producers in November were estimated to be responsible for between 48 percent and 60 percent of the world's oversupply of steel – an overabundance that has lowered prices and profitability around the world as China's steel exports climbed to a record [112.4 million tons](http://www.zacks.com/stock/news/204010/chinas-steel-exports-shoot-up-20-in-2015-to-record-high" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://www.zacks.com/stock/news/204010/chinas-steel-exports-shoot-up-20-in-2015-to-record-high) in 2015. The country went a step further in [December](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-09/china-to-cut-some-steel-export-taxes-in-2016-amid-worsening-glut" \t "_blank" \o "Link: http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-09/china-to-cut-some-steel-export-taxes-in-2016-amid-worsening-glut) by slashing export tariffs on domestic producers, effectively allowing Chinese companies that sell steel overseas to potentially bring in more profits. So it's unsurprising that the U.S. is among a host of international bodies taking aim at what they perceive to be unfair Chinese trade practices. What this means going forward is hard to say. The Commerce Department in December recommended a preliminary tariff of 256 percent, which was increased Tuesday to 266 percent. The higher duties for China and the rest of the countries named in the Commerce Department's investigation are expected to kick in at some point in the next few days but must pass final approval later in the year. The next few months of tariff deliberations with China, Brazil and others almost certainly won't involve Donald Trump. But for a brief and shining moment, the GOP front-runner and the Obama administration appear to be on the same page.

### Tech Transfers

#### Massive opposition to the plan – security and intelligence concerns

Segal ‘4 – Maurice R. Greenberg Senior Fellow for China Studies and Director of the Digital and Cyberspace Policy Program,

(Adam, Summer 2004, "Practical Engagement: Drawing a Fine Line for U.S.-China Trade," Council on Foreign Relations, http://www.cfr.org/china/practical-engagement-drawing-fine-line-us-china-trade/p7063)//AP

Technologically obsolete, geographically isolated, and dominated by moribund state-owned enterprises, China’s military S&T system traditionally has lagged behind the technology used by the country’s commercial producers. An innovative civilian sector in China might change this imbalance, how-ever, by creating what James Mulvenon has called the “digital triangle”— close cooperation among government research and development (R&D) institutes, the military, and commercial enterprises involved in information technology (IT)—to develop advanced technologies for civilian and military use.8 Seeking access to China’s domestic market, U.S. firms often cooperate with Chinese producers and, as a result, may transfer technologies or management skills that could improve China’s capacity to coordinate complex military systems. Finally, opponents of engagement with China fear that technology transfers and foreign direct investment might create a second-order security problem: the threat of technological dependence on China (or on manufacturers located in China). In the case of semiconductors, for example, the fear is that the location of manufacturing facilities in China might prevent the U.S. Department of Defense and U.S. intelligence agencies from securing “first access and assured access to secure advanced chip-making capability.”9

### TPP

#### **Passage saps PC – bipartisan opposition growing**

Bolton, 3/15/16 (Andrew, senior reporter at The Hill, *Anti-trade Republicans press Trump advantage*, The Hill, <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/272974-anti-trade-republicans-press-trump-advantage/MS>)

Republican opponents of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) are trying to kill the largest trade deal in U.S. history by invoking [Donald Trump](http://thehill.com/people/donald-trump). Noting the vehemence of opposition to the trade deal in Michigan, they argue their party would face a backlash by seeking to move it. “The way the votes are going and the way that issue is playing out, it’s becoming more and more clear that it’s a major issue on which people will vote. ... I don’t think Republicans should bring it up,” said Sen. [**Jeff Sessions**](http://thehill.com/people/jeff-sessions) (R-Ala.), the only sitting GOP senator to endorse Trump’s White House bid. “There’s a growing strength among the people who oppose this agreement, and I think it would be very damaging to the Republican Party to try to jam it through at the last minute after the elections are over.” Trump rolled to victory in Michigan in part on an anti-trade message and is looking to rack up more wins in Ohio, Illinois, Florida, Missouri and North Carolina on Tuesday. The anti-globalization message has also won support in the Democratic primary, where [Bernie Sanders](http://thehill.com/people/bernie-sanders) was the upset victor in Michigan over [Hillary Clinton](http://thehill.com/people/hillary-clinton). The opposition to trade is making it less and less likely that the deal negotiated by President Obama will even be considered in the post-election lame-duck session of Congress, when tough votes are sometimes scheduled. “I doubt seriously it’s going to come up after the election,” said Sen. Thom Tillis (R-N.C.), another Republican opponent of the deal. “If you take a look at the bipartisan opposition to the agreement for any number of reasons, it would be highly unlikely that they succeed.” Republicans in Congress say the political environment has changed dramatically since both chambers voted last year to give Obama fast-track authority to negotiate the TPP. “Who would be arguing for bringing up TPP in a lame-duck session? I don’t think anybody thinks this is a good issue to bring up right now,” said a senior GOP aide. “There seems to be a lot of suspicion of the deal out there across the country. We may be out of touch, but we’re not that out of touch.” Obama has sought to push back at the anti-trade rhetoric, warning at a joint press conference last week with Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau that imposing the high tariffs Trump has called for — such as a 45 percent fee on Chinese exports to the United States — would hurt the domestic economy. “To sell a bill of goods to the American people and workers that if you just shut down trade somehow your problems will go away prevents us from actually solving some of these big problems about inequality and the decline of our manufacturing base,” Obama said. GOP leaders in both chambers have been cool to the TPP because of separate concerns about the final negotiated deal. And Clinton, who backed the TPP as Obama’s secretary of State, has now turned against it. Americans for Limited Government released a poll last week showing that 59 percent of likely Republican voters believe free trade helps other countries more than it does the United States. The survey also found that 66 percent of Republicans oppose the TPP when given arguments for and against it. “Passing the Trans-Pacific Partnership in a lame-duck would be the most cynical type of politics,” said Rick Manning, the president of Americans for Limited Government. If the trade deal is scrapped for the entire year, an agreement involving the United States and the 11 other TPP countries, which cover 36 percent of global gross domestic product, may have to be scrapped or substantially renegotiated. Supporters of the trade deal argue that fiery rhetoric on trade from Trump and Clinton should give lawmakers and big business groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce incentive to get the trade deal passed this year, while Obama is in office. Some smaller business groups, meanwhile, are piling onto Republicans, warning that any effort to move the TPP after the election will prompt a furious backlash. “If [Mitch McConnell](http://thehill.com/people/mitch-mcconnell) tries to jam through the TPP in a lame-duck session, it will be further evidence to confirm Americans’ suspicions that the system is rigged against them,” said Curtis Ellis, executive director of the American Jobs Alliance, referring to the Senate Republican leader from Kentucky. He argued that it would be hypocritical of McConnell to block action on Obama’s Supreme Court nominee but wave the trade deal through the Senate. “Why would he let Obama shape the future of this country by giving him the Trans-Pacific Partnership?” he said.

#### TPP faces massive bipartisan opposition

Davis, 16 (Bob, senior editor of WSJ who covers economic issues out of the Washington D.C. bureau, especially those that will play out in the presidential campaign. He also continues to write about China, where he was posted from 2011 to 2014, March 9, 2016, <http://www.wsj.com/articles/free-trade-loses-political-favor-1457571366/MS>)

After decades in which successive Republican and Democratic presidents have pushed to open U.S. and global markets, resentment toward free trade now appears to have the upper hand in both parties, making passage this year of a sweeping Pacific trade deal far less likely and clouding the longer-term outlook for international economic exchange. Many Democrats have long blamed free-trade deals for big job losses and depressed wages, especially in the industrialized Midwest, which has been battered over the years by competition from lower-cost manufacturing centers in countries like Japan, Mexico and China. But one big surprise Tuesday was how loudly trade fears reverberated among Republican voters in the primary contests in Michigan and Mississippi—evidence, many observers say, of a widening undercurrent of skepticism on the right about who reaps the benefits from loosened trade restrictions. Donald Trump, the leading contender for the Republican presidential nomination, has expressed fervent opposition to the Trans-Pacific Partnership pact and other trade deals, as has Sen. Bernie Sanders on the Democratic side. Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton, whose husband signed the North American Free Trade Agreement as president in 1994, now also opposes the Pacific deal and has increasingly voiced doubts about trade in terms similar to those of Mr. Sanders. Mr. Trump won the Michigan and Mississippi primaries by wide margins, and among voters who were trade skeptics, his margin of victory surpassed his overall margin. Trade jitters also helped propel Mr. Sanders to a narrow victory in Michigan, where he frequently lambasted Mrs. Clinton for backing Nafta and for being late in opposing the unratified TPP pact between a dozen Pacific rim nations. According to Michigan exit polls, Democratic voters who believed trade deals reduce U.S. jobs backed Mr. Sanders by a 56% to 41% margin. And in Mississippi, it was Republicans who said trade was a job killer, not Democrats, according to exit polls. Democrats there by a 43% to 41% margin said trade boosted job growth. “In some ways, the Republican Party is becoming like the traditional Democratic Party” in its opposition to free trade, said Tony Fratto, a former official in the George W. Bush administration who now consults with business on trade issues. In recent years, he said, voters had joined the ranks of Republicans because of opposition to President Barack Obama, rather than a commitment to traditional GOP positions such as favoring free trade. Since Congress approved Nafta, trade has become an increasingly divisive political issue. Democrats have taken the lead in opposing new deals, saying the U.S. loses millions of jobs due to imports produced by far cheaper labor in less developed countries. Democratic support for free trade has declined over the years. Last year, only 28 Democrats in the House voted to give President Obama so-called fast-track authority to negotiate trade deals, compared with 102 who voted for Nafta. Less noticed has been faltering support among Republicans. In a June 2015 Wall Street Journal/NBC news poll, taken shortly after the fast-track vote, overall respondents, by 34% to 29% margin, said free trade hurt the U.S. But Republicans were far more negative than Democrats. GOP voters, by 38% to 28%, said free trade harmed the U.S., while Democrats said trade helped by a 35% to 29% edge. Mr. Trump, who regularly argues that the U.S. has been fleeced in trade negotiations with Mexico, China and Japan, has capitalized and expanded on that anti-free-trade sentiment, said Patrick Buchanan, a populist Republican who used the trade issue to power his challenge to President George H.W. Bush in 1992. Free trade has become what Mr. Buchanan calls “a voting issue”—meaning one that attracts voters who care intensely about that particular measure—akin to gun rights and abortion. “I don’t think you can negotiate a free-trade deal and have it go through,” Mr. Buchanan said. Indeed, Tuesday night’s results show how difficult it would be in this environment for congressional Republican leaders to seek passage this year of the TPP, a pact the White House sees as a linchpin to its commercial and foreign-policy strategy to compete with China—which isn’t a party to the deal—in the Pacific region. Republican support helped keep the pact alive last year against heavy opposition from Democrats, but the GOP backing has weakened sharply in recent months. Rep. Walter Jones, a North Carolina Republican who generally opposes free-trade deals, said that the primaries would slow any effort in Congress to consider the TPP, which was finished last year but needs congressional approval. A vote on the trade deal “would create a campaign issue,” he said. “If the leadership starts pushing [TPP], it would be a negative” for the trade deal. Last year, Congress approved fast-track trade authority by a 219-to-211 vote. Fast-track approval means Congress can approve or disprove trade pacts but not amend them. Fifty-four Republicans opposed the bill, which was widely seen as a prelude to a vote on TPP. Mr. Jones estimates that at least an additional 20 to 25 Republicans would now oppose the deal itself. Proponents of the trade bill have similar estimates. Rick Manning, president of the conservative Americans for Limited Government, said an anti-free trade position has become a natural fit for Republicans worried about big government. That’s because the deals benefit politically connected companies that can get the ear of U.S. negotiators, he argued. Trade deals represent “corporate cronyism at its worst,” he said. In a survey of 1,200 people conducted for his group by Caddell Associates, Republicans by a 59% to 4% margin said trade deals benefited “other countries” more than the U.S. Fourteen percent said both sides benefited equally. Among Democrats, the edge was 35% to 12% for other countries, with 26% saying both sides benefited. For years, trade experts dismissed opponents’ claims of widespread harm caused by trade deals. Trade rejiggered jobs so that those laid off would be able to find new work after a period of retraining, according to many experts. ‘*‘I don’t think you can negotiate a free-trade deal and have it go through.’*’—Republican Patrick Buchanan But more recently, there has been a rethinking of the costs, spurred in part by the work of economists David Autor of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, David Dorn of the University of Zurich and Gordon Hanson of the University of California at San Diego. [In a 2013 paper called “The China syndrome,”](http://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1257/aer.103.6.2121" \t "_blank) the three economists attributed one-fourth of the decline in U.S. manufacturing employment between 1990 and 2007 to competition from Chinese imports. [In a follow-up paper this year](http://www.ddorn.net/papers/Autor-Dorn-Hanson-ChinaShock_New.pdf" \t "_blank), the three found that employment in the U.S. is “remarkably slow” to rebound from Chinese import competition with wages and labor-force participation remaining depressed for at least a decade. Mr. Fratto, the former Bush administration official, said the stronger opposition to trade puts more of an onus on the Obama White House and businesses to explain the benefits of trade, which include improved productivity for competing firms and a greater array of imports and lower prices for consumer goods. Trade deals were often promoted as a way to improve U.S. standing in the world by deepening relations with allies, he said, rather than the ways it benefited ordinary Americans.

## TPP good

### TPP Solves US-Sino Relations

#### TPP is vital to provide US with leverage to ensure a cooperative relationship with China

Green 2014

Dr. Michael Green, Senior Vice President for Asia and Japan Chair, Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) Associate Professor, Edmund A. Walsh

School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, “TPP AND AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGY IN THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION” March 17, 2014 (DMR)

The Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) represents the most important effort to modernize trade across the Pacific in a generation. The negotiations with Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam are almost complete and offer significant economic and trade gains to the United States. The Peterson Institute’s 2012 model demonstrates annual economic gains of $77.5 billion in 2025 for the United States in 2007 dollars with an increase of exports by $124 billion. A successful TPP agreement will build on global trading agreements at Doha by expanding into uncovered areas such as services, investment, competition, regulatory coherence. TPP will strengthen investor protection, discipline large state owned enterprises, enhance intellectual property rights protection and integrate the existing “spaghetti bowl” of trading agreements –all making it easier and fairer for large, medium and small U.S. firms to export to the world’s most dynamic region. But as Robert Morris, Alfred Thayer Mahan, or Franklin Delano Roosevelt would add – TPP will also reinforce American strategic interests in the Asia Pacific region at a time of major uncertainty. America turned protectionist in the 1930s just as Japan was emerging as a revisionist power seeking to push the United States out of the Pacific. Today we face a similar, if somewhat more benign circumstance. The United States is more powerful today than we were in the 1930s and Asia is made up of nation states rather than loosely held and vulnerable European colonies as it was before the war. Moreover, most of the states are democratic or transitioning towards democracy. Nevertheless, China’s rhetoric and behavior in the region bear some menacing overtones from previous eras and have rattled neighboring states from India to Japan. Last April in Shanghai, President Xi Jinping called for a “new security order in Asia” without “blocs” –a direct reference to the network of U.S. alliances that have kept the peace since the war. The Peoples Liberation Army budget has increased at double digit growth rates over the past two decades, arming China with new capabilities to challenge the United States in outer-space, cyber-space and the offshore island chain stretching from Japan through the Philippines to the Straits of Malacca. As CSIS demonstrated with previously unavailable footage on our Asia Maritime Transparency Initiative (AMTI) website, China has converted six small rocky crops in the South China Sea into military facilities designed to increase military dominance over smaller countries like the Philippines and Vietnam with which Beijing is contesting control of maritime domain. At the same time, it is important to emphasize that Beijing still considers the United States to be its most important strategic counterpart and trading partner in the world and Xi has proposed a “New Model of Great Power Relations” with Washington aimed at sharing rather than contesting power in the Pacific. If we were a declining or even static power, such power-sharing might be tempting. In fact, however, we are a nation with unique competitiveness, abundant energy, and allies and partners in the Asia Pacific eager to see us lead. We are therefore positioned to shape a new cooperative relationship with China based not on relaxing the rules and splitting our differences, but instead on a broadening and deepening of the rules that would dissuade China from revisionism and encourage peaceful cooperation and integration down the road. Successful completion of TPP is central to that mission in three ways. First, TPP will solidify our key alliances and partnerships. Japan is the linchpin of American presence in the Asia Pacific region, hosting our major air and naval assets and standing as a partner on rule-making and support for democracy and development across the region. When Prime Minster Shinzo Abe decided to join the TPP negotiations in 2013, it energized American exporters and blunted China’s efforts to convince smaller countries not to join. Japan has the third largest economy in the world, yet only about 17% of Japanese trade is covered by economic partnerships or free trade agreements. The Abe government has already made significant moves to reform the agricultural sector and the differences in our position with Japan in the negotiations are now small in dollar terms, though politically sensitive. On the rule-making side, we and Japan are essentially on the same page. Japan stands to gain $119 billion annually from TPP according to the Green: TPP Testimony to HFAC March 17, 2014 Peterson Institute study. More importantly, TPP would open Japan’s market to American and regional imports and investment, adding real momentum to Prime Minister Abe’s “third arrow” of structural reform and further aligning Washington and Tokyo for liberalization elsewhere –increasing the incentives for countries like Vietnam and Malaysia to complete negotiations, for Korea to “dock” the KORUS Free Trade Agreement with TPP, and for China to change the arc of its economic policy towards integration with 21st Century rules for trade. Second, successful TPP negotiations will set the standard for competing trade negotiations in the Asia-Pacific region that do not include the United States. Principal among these is the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), which covers the ten ASEAN member countries and six of their major trading partners — China, Japan, India, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand. RCEP has its roots in Malaysian Prime Minister Mohammed Mahathir’s concept of an “East Asian Economic Community” which he hoped in the late 1980s would counter the establishment of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summits and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). With the presence of U.S. allies like Japan and Australia in the talks, RCEP is unlikely to become an anti-U.S. bloc, but the group is dominated by China and other countries that will drive for lower levels of liberalization and a less binding set of rules for state-owned enterprises, labor and the environment. In surveys of Asian elites taken last spring, CSIS found that a majority of experts thought TPP had greater momentum than RCEP. That increases the likelihood that TPP will set higher standards for liberalization and empower countries like Japan, Australia or Singapore that want those Asian-only negotiations to strive for NAFTA-plus outcomes. TPP and RCEP do not necessarily have to be in a zero-sum race against each other –competitive trade liberalization means that those countries counting on lower standards of trade liberalization will be pressed by TPP completion to open more themselves. The neteffect will be rule-making led by Washington in partnership with Tokyo, Canberra and other like-minded states and therefore a regional architecture of institutions that reduces the temptation for rising powers to try to change the rules. Third, successful TPP negotiations will align the entire region better as China chooses its own economic future. Initially, Beijing was hostile to TPP, charging that the negotiation was aimed at “containing” China by creating a collective security framework like NATO in Asia. Chinese diplomats and proxies actively lobbied against TPP in countries like Japan, Australia and Malaysia. Once Japan joined the negotiations, however, TPP became a force too large for China to blunt. Japan’s participation also coincided with a somewhat more ambitious economic reform plan under Xi and Chinese Premier Li Keqiang. Chinese officials began arguing that perhaps TPP would be useful for China’s economic reform as a source of external pressure the way WTO succession was in the 1990s as then-Premier Zhu Rongji restructured state-owned enterprises. In the Sunnylands U.S.-China summit last June the Chinese side requested a briefing on TPP. Then as host of APEC last November, Xi Jinping called for moving towards FTAAP –a free trade area of the Asia Pacific tabled in the 2007 Sydney APEC summit. FTAAP would include all the APEC members, among them China. The other TPP members are certainly not ready to include China in the talks yet, but Beijing’s recent moves signal that TPP plays a critical role in shaping China’s own internal debate about reform and integration with world trading system. Coupled with TTIP, TPP has real potential to not only pull China into modern rule-making, but re-energize global talks at Doha as a whole. To conclude, one might briefly consider the national security impact should TPP talks completely stall this year. The U.S. economy is strong enough to weather any breakdown in trade talks for now, but President Obama’s goal of increasing exports would suffer over the longer-term as alternate trade agreements drew to a close without our rules or our membership. Meanwhile, our Asian allies and partners would begin questioning the commitment of the administration and Congress to the Asia Pacific region, including our will power to resist Chinese coercion, North Korean provocations, and backsliding on democratization in Burma/Myanmar. TPP does not offer a specific solution to any of these challenges, but it does indicate how ready we are to continue leading in the region. Japan’s stock market would probably react negatively to any break-down of TPP talks and investors would question Prime Minister Abe’s commitment to reform and restructuring. A hit to Japanese growth and credibility would be a hit to U.S. strategic interests. China meanwhile, would return to debating its own economic future without the prospect of an over-arching set of global and trans-Pacific rules and institutions that would determine Beijing’s own competitiveness and ability to grow. American leadership, trade -- and ultimately security—would suffer.

### TTP Solves Asia Leadership

#### Further delay undermines US leadership – particularly in Asia

Kit 6/20

Tang See Kit, Assistant Producer at CNBC.com's Asia-Pacific team. She writes the daily market report on Asian stocks, alongside feature articles with a focus on Asian economies. Channel NewsAsia “Hurdles to US ratification leave fate of TPP deal hanging” 20 Jun 2016

http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/business/hurdles-to-us/2886288.html

Observers say the potential hurdles in the US will not derail Asian governments who are already moving ahead with preparations for the implementation of the trade deal. "Every country will want TPP to be ratified as soon as possible after all the time and effort spent on negotiations, but I don’t think governments in Asia are losing sleep over it either. And they are certainly not waiting," said Dr Cassey Lee, senior fellow at the Iseas-Yusof Ishak Institute, adding that preparations such as redrafting new laws for certain sectors and administrative reforms have begun in countries like Vietnam, Singapore and Malaysia. For the US, however, any further delays could undermine American credibility in this part of the world where it has been actively reinforcing economic and military cooperation so as to counter a rising China. "If the TPP is not ratified, the US would lose some credibility of its own," Ms Pitakdumrongkit said. "Being unable to ratify the deal means that the US, which is seen as the leader of the TPP deal, defaults on its own agreement with other countries. That will not help its image or reputation abroad." [Assistant Professor Kaewkamol Pitakdumrongkit from the Centre for Multilateralism Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore.]

**Trade Impact**

**Trade – Panzer**

**Protectionism sparks global nuclear war**

**Panzer 8** (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to **full-scale military encounters**, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions byrogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of humyn instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing **biological** or **nuclear** weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new **world war**.

### TPP – Suominem

**TPP– they’re key to sustaining the global trade order**

**Suominen,** Adjunct Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 8-4-**14** (Kati, Adjunct Professor at the UCLA Anderson School of Management, “Coming Apart: WTO fiasco highlights urgency for the U.S. to lead the global trading system)

India’s torpedoing last week the WTO’s trade facilitation agreement, struck at the last minute between the United States and India in the December 2013 WTO Ministerial in Bali, is a **death blow** to the world body and adds to growing disarray in the global trading system. Two threats are emerging. The first is disintegration of the trading system. The core of the system until the mid-1990s, the WTO is utterly dysfunctional: deals require unanimity among 160 members, making any cantankerous player like India a veto. Aligning interests has been impossible, turning all action in global trade policymaking to free trade agreements (FTAs), first kicked off by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994. By now, 400 FTAs are in place or under negotiation. FTAs have been good cholesterol for trade, but the overlapping deals and rules also complicate life for U.S. companies doing global business. One single deal among all countries would be much preferable to the “spaghetti bowl” of FTAs, but it is but a pie in the sky. So is deeper liberalization by protectionist countries like India. The U.S.-led talks for “mega-regional” agreements with Europe and Asia-Pacific nations, the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), are the best solution yet to these problems. They free trade and create uniform rules among countries making up two-thirds of the world economy. Incidentally, they would create a million jobs in America. Yet both hang in balance thanks to inaction on Capitol Hill to pass the Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), the key piece of legislation for approving the mega-deals, now stuck in a bitter political fight as several Democrats and Tea Party line up in opposition. TPA is key for the Obama administration to conclude TPP and TTIP talks: Europeans and Asians are unwilling to negotiate the thorniest topics before they know TPA is in place to constrain U.S. Congress to voting up or down on these deals, rather than amending freshly negotiated texts. The second threat in world trade is the absence of common rules of the game for the 21st century global digital economy. As 3D printing, Internet of Things, and cross-border ecommerce, and other disruptive technologies expand trade in digital goods and services, intellectual property will be fair game – why couldn’t a company around the world simply replicate 3D printable products and designs Made in the USA? Another problem is data protectionism – rules on access and transport of data across borders. Europeans are imposing limits on companies’ access to consumer data, complicating U.S. businesses’ customer service and marketing; emerging markets such as Brazil and Vietnam are forcing foreign IT companies to locate servers and build data centers as a condition for market access, measure that costs companies millions in inefficiencies. A growing number of countries claim limits on access to data on the grounds of “national security” and “public safety”, familiar code words for protectionism. Digital protectionism risks balkanizing the global virtual economy just as tariffs siloed national markets in the 19th century when countries set out to collect revenue and promote infant industries – a self-defeating approach that took well over a century to undo, and is still alive and well in countries like India. The biggest losers of digital protectionism are American small businesses and consumers leveraging their laptops, iPads and smart phones to buy and sell goods and services around the planet. Trade policymakers however lag far behind today’s trade, which requires sophisticated rules on IP, piracy, copyrights, patents and trademarks, ecommerce, data flows, virtual currencies, and dispute settlement. The mega-regionals, especially the TTIP, are a perfect venue to start this process. Disintegration of trade policies risk disintegrating world markets. Just as after World War II, the global trading system rests in America’s hands. Three things are needed. The first is the approval of TPA, which unshackles U.S. negotiators to finalize TPP and TTIP. Most interesting for U.S. exporters, TPP and TTIP almost de facto merge into a superdeal: the United States and EU already have bilateral FTAs with several common partners belonging in TPP – Peru, Colombia, Chile, Australia, Singapore, Canada, and Mexico to name a few. What’s more, gatekeepers to markets with two-thirds of global spending power, TPP and TTIP will be giant magnetic docking stations to outsiders; China and Brazil, aiming to revive sagging growth, are interested. Once this happens, the TTIP-TPP superdeal will cover 80 percent of world’s output and approximate a multilateral agreement – and have cutting-edge common trade rules that could never be agreed in one Big Bang at the WTO. Second, also needed is a shift negotiation of plurilateral agreements – broad-based agreements among sub-sets of WTO members now negotiated in trade in services and in environmental goods and services, and proposed for investment and data security, and now also for trade facilitation sans India. The coalitions of the willing driving plurilaterals include the United States, EU, Japan, and many Latin American and Asian emerging markets disillusioned by India and its accomplices, Cuba, Bolivia, and Venezuela. A pivot in trade politics, China is looking to join the services plurilateral. Plurilaterals not only help American companies to export more; they enable Washington and its friends and allies to call the shots in global trade rulemaking – and isolate India, proving its policies self-defeating. The third deal that is needed is Washington Consensus II, for the global digital economy. In the 1990s, the Washington Consensus set off a wave of deep trade and investment liberalization across the developing and post-communist world, paving the way for a tidal wave of globalization. The digital economy has no equivalent. A broad group of stakeholders and thought-leaders – governments, international organizations, companies, and think-tanks – need to come together to articulate guidelines for nations’ behavior in the global digital economy. Given its infamous connotations, the digital deal could be called “Seoul Consensus”, highlighting Korea’s leap to a leader in digitization from a rural economy just a couple of decades ago. U.S. leadership is urgently needed to integrate the rapidly changing global trading system. It is time for Congress to step up to the plate.

**Trade Hotspots**

**Reviving trade key to resolve every major global hotspot**

Miriam **Sapiro 14**, Visiting Fellow in the Global Economy and Development program at Brookings, former Deputy US Trade Representative, former Director of European Affairs at the National Security Council, “Why Trade Matters,” September 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2014/09/why%20trade%20matters/trade%20global%20views\_final.pdf

This policy brief explores the economic rationale and strategic imperative of an ambitious domestic and global trade agenda from the perspective of the United States. International trade is often viewed through the relatively narrow prism of trade-offs that might be made among domestic sectors or between trading partners, but it is important to consider also the impact that increased trade has on global growth, development and security. With that context in mind, this paper assesses the implications of the Asia-Pacific and European trade negotiations underway, including for countries that are not participating but aspire to join. It outlines some of the challenges that stand in the way of completion and ways in which they can be addressed. It examines whether the focus on “mega-regional” trade agreements comes at the expense of broader liberalization or acts as a catalyst to develop higher standards than might otherwise be possible. It concludes with policy recommendations for action by governments, legislators and stakeholders to address concerns that have been raised and create greater domestic support.¶ It is fair to ask whether we should be concerned about the future of international trade policy when **dire developments are threatening** the security interests of the United States and its partners in the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Europe. In the Middle East, significant areas of Iraq have been overrun by a toxic offshoot of Al-Qaeda, civil war in Syria rages with no end in sight, and the Israeli-Palestinian peace process is in tatters. **Nuclear negotiations** with Iran have run into trouble, while Libya and Egypt face continuing instability and domestic challenges. In Asia, historic rivalries and disputes over territory have **heightened tensions** across the region, most acutely by China’s aggressive moves in the **S**outh **C**hina **S**ea towards Vietnam, Japan and the Philippines. **Nuclear-armed North Korea** remains isolated, reckless and unpredictable. In Africa, countries are struggling with rising terrorism, violence and corruption. In Europe, Russia continues to foment instability and destruction in eastern Ukraine. And within the European Union, lagging economic recovery and the surge in support for extremist parties have left people fearful of increasing violence against immigrants and minority groups and skeptical of further integration.¶ It is tempting to focus solely on these pressing problems and defer less urgent issues—such as forging new disciplines for international trade—to another day, especially when such issues pose challenges of their own. But that would be a mistake. A key motivation in building greater domestic and international consensus for **advancing trade liberalization** now is precisely the role that greater economic integration can play in opening up new avenues of opportunity for promoting development and increasing economic prosperity. Such initiatives can help **stabilize key regions** and **strengthen** the **security** of the United States and its partners.¶ The last century provides a powerful example of how expanding trade relations can help **reduce global tensions** and raise living standards. Following World War II, building stronger economic cooperation was a centerpiece of allied efforts to erase battle scars and embrace former enemies. In defeat, the economies of Germany, Italy and Japan faced ruin and people were on the verge of starvation. The United States led efforts to rebuild Europe and to repair Japan’s economy. **A key element** of the Marshall Plan, which established the foundation for unprecedented growth and the level of European integration that exists today, was to **revive trade** by reducing tariffs.1 Russia, and the eastern part of Europe that it controlled, refused to participate or receive such assistance. Decades later, as the Cold War ended, the United States and Western Europe sought to make up for lost time by providing significant technical and financial assistance to help integrate central and eastern European countries with the rest of Europe and the global economy. ¶ There have been subsequent calls for a “Marshall Plan” for other parts of the world,2 although the confluence of dedicated resources, coordinated support and existing capacity has been difficult to replicate. Nonetheless, important lessons have been learned about the valuable role economic development can play in **defusing tensions**, and how opening markets can hasten growth. There is again a growing recognition that economic security and national security are two sides of the same coin. General Carter Ham, who stepped down as head of U.S. Africa Command last year, observed the close connection between increasing prosperity and bolstering stability. During his time in Africa he had seen that “security and stability in many ways depends a lot more on economic growth and opportunity than it does on military strength.”3 Where people have opportunities for themselves and their children, he found, the result was better governance, increased respect for human rights and lower levels of conflict.¶ During his confirmation hearing last year, Secretary John Kerry stressed the link between economic and national security in the context of the competitiveness of the United States but the point also has broader application. Our nation cannot be strong abroad, he argued, if it is not strong at home, including by putting its own fiscal house in order. He asserted—rightly so—that “more than ever foreign policy is economic policy,” particularly in light of increasing competition for global resources and markets. Every day, he said, “that goes by where America is uncertain about engaging in that arena, or unwilling to put our best foot forward and win, **unwilling to demonstrate our resolve to lead**, is a day in which we weaken our nation itself.”4¶ Strengthening America’s economic security by **cementing** its **economic alliances** is not simply an option, but an **imperative**. A strong nation needs a strong economy that can generate growth, spur innovation and create jobs. This is true, of course, not only for the United States but also for its key partners and the rest of the global trading system. Much as the United States led the way in forging strong military alliances after World War II to discourage a resurgence of militant nationalism in Europe or Asia, now is the time to place equal emphasis on shoring up our collective economic security. A failure to act now could **undermine** international security and place **stability in key regions** in further jeopardy.

**Trade – Laundry list**

**Trade solves the aff**

**Dreier 11** – Rep. Chairman of the House Rules Committee

(Rep. David Dreier, 1/5/11, Politico, “Bipartisanship can revive economy,” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0111/47044.html)

There are no higher priorities for our country right now than job creation and economic growth.

As the new Congress begins, every decision we make must be tied directly to those goals. If we are going to get our economy back on track, we need to take several key steps. These include making the current tax rates permanent, repealing the job-killing health care law and dramatically reducing federal spending.¶ Some of these efforts will divide Congress politically. But they are all a part of what House Republicans pledged we would do — and of what the American people expect us to do.¶ At the same time, **there are areas in which both parties can work together. A strong trade agenda presents a unique opportunity to promote economic growth, global partnerships and bipartisan cooperation.¶** Unfortunately, the **trade agenda has been allowed to languish** for the past four years and, in some cases, has been thwarted. **In the meantime, our economy and our global prestige have suffered. There’s never been a more important time to re-engage on trade.**¶ Trade is often blamed for every manner of society’s ills. **Globally connected commerce has been accused of having a hand in everything from terrorism to pandemics.** In December, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez blamed it for the tragic mudslides that claimed dozens of lives in his nation and in Colombia.¶ Setting aside the disservice that such a claim does for addressing the true root causes of the great challenges we face, **the reality of the role of trade is precisely the opposite of what this viewpoint presents. International trade plays an important part in improving a nation’s circumstances** — far beyond the immediate scope of exports and imports.¶ **Given the current climate, the direct economic impact is the most urgent. Opening up new markets for U.S. producers, farmers, service providers and investors is essential for spurring growth and creating new job opportunities for both union and nonunion workers here at home.** The three markets with which we have pending free-trade agreements — Colombia, Panama and South Korea — represent 96 million consumers and $1.8 trillion in economic activity. **The opportunity for U.S. job creators is enormous**, so the delay in the agreements’ consideration is unjustifiable.¶ The benefits of trade, however, extend considerably beyond job creation and economic growth. **Economic engagement across borders builds the strong global partnerships that are necessary to address the challenges of the 21st century. Whether the issue is tariffs or nuclear proliferation, the trust and spirit of collaboration forged through economic ties help the** United States **advance its interests and spread its values around the globe.¶ Enhancing prosperity through international trade also creates the resources necessary for essential efforts like improving environmental quality, protecting human rights and building democratic institutions.** **Raising living standards, in fact, helps alleviate many of society’s ills, including terrorism, pandemics** and, yes, even the ability to respond to natural disasters in South America.

### Trade Declining

#### Trade slow in status quo – emerging economies and weak demand.

World Bank 3/9 (International financial institution that provides loans to developing countries, “Emerging Economies Drive Global Trade Volatility in 2015,” 9 March 2016, <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2016/03/09/emerging-economies-drive-global-trade-volatility-in-2015>, \**fc*)

After dramatically declining in the first half of 2015, global trade recovered but at a slower pace over the rest of the year, so that world imports grew by only 1.7 percent in 2015 compared to 3 percent in 2014. According to a new World Bank Group paper, Global Trade Watch: Trade Development in 2015, by World Bank Group Economists Cristina Constantinescu, Aaditya Mattoo and Michele Ruta, global trade in 2015 reflected persistently weak demand and structural changes in world trade, compounded by falling commodity prices and China’s transition to a new growth path. “This paper builds on our earlier research that showed the global trade slowdown began in the early 2000s but has become more evident since the great recession, and had both cyclical and structural determinants,” the authors said. “Now we have found that in the context of the broader global trade slowdown, 2015 appears to have distinct characteristics compared to previous years. And our estimates suggest that cyclical factors dominated in 2015, accounting for approximately two thirds of the trade slowdown.” The authors found that while weak import demand was mostly concentrated in advanced economies in previous years, trade developments in 2015 can be traced to emerging economies. Emerging Asia which makes up more than a quarter of world trade was the epicenter of the global trade slowdown and the initial rebound. Other regions also played a role. In particular, trade developments in Latin America, Europe and Central Asia mostly reflected lower imports of recession hit commodity exporters such as Brazil and Russia. In addition, the paper also says that lower commodity prices and China’s transition to a new growth path were two mutually reinforcing factors that created weak import demand in emerging economies. Lower commodity prices reduced commodity producers’ incomes leading those countries to import less from all other regions, including China. At the same time, China’s gradual shift from investment to consumption and the decline in its industrial production reduced China’s imports from other regions, including commodity producers. If China’s imports had not fallen in 2015, world merchandise import volume growth would have been 2.1 percent instead of the actual 1.7 percent. China’s transition is affecting the pattern of production and trade in East Asia and beyond, and the impact can also be seen in changes in manufacturing and services trade. Manufacturers, particularly in East Asia, suffered significant declines in export quantities but are now recovering. Since the slowdown was concentrated in China’s industrial sector, which is both more import intensive and more strongly linked to global value chains, the impact on trade was magnified. However, in the longer term, rebalancing from investment to consumption is also likely to create opportunities.

#### Trade declining – protectionist policies.

Finkel 5/12 (Isobel Finkel, Reporter for Bloomberg News, “The New Protectionism Will Hit Emerging Markets Right Where it Hurts, Says HSBC,” Bloomberg, 12 May 2016, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-05-12/hsbc-warns-on-declining-trade-volumes-bad-for-all-and-worse-for-emerging-markets>, \**fc*)

In a world of reduced trade everyone loses out, but some lose out more than others. That's the takeaway from a new report by economists at HSBC Holdings PLC, who say the surge in protectionist measures that's been shrinking global trade volumes is going to hit developing markets and their assets the hardest. The protectionist policies being advocated in the run-up to the U.S. election are just one manifestation of a surge in anxiety about the outside world that's dragging down efforts to make global trade more open, according to HSBC's Senior Trade Economist Douglas Lippoldt and its Global Head of Asset Allocation, Fredrik Nerbrand. After contributing to the success of isolationist politicians in the U.S., a less open world will also have wide-ranging implications for investors as it stokes inflation and erodes returns on bonds. Bond yields will rise, but they'll also become more volatile as inflationary pressures grow less predictable. Trade barriers will make it increasingly important to pay attention to idiosyncratic economic and political events, rather than global trends in monetary policy. And economies that depend on exports are going to be in trouble. "The emerging world is likely to be the main loser from this scenario though as their growth models have largely been structured to cater for growing trade rather than domestic consumption," Lippoldt and Nerbrand say. Their point is that even though developing markets have been among the most enthusiastic about measures that discriminate in favor of local producers, that may not be serving their interests when a high share of their GDP is geared towards trade. HSBC's analysis plays on the paradigm of the Fragile Five, a term coined in 2013 by Morgan Stanley analysts to describe five emerging markets whose large external financing needs made them vulnerable to swings in global sentiment. Their theory was borne out, as rising interest rates have helped currencies considered vulnerable by Morgan Stanley to register losses against the U.S. dollar, and eroded bond returns for the vast majority of the group. Yet HSBC's new report suggests that the problem's inverse — a shrinking current account deficit — is no cure for that vulnerability, when hiding behind a narrowing trade gap is a decline in overall volumes of trade. As they say, "A more protectionist world is a more volatile one."

#### Trade declining in Asia – Chinese growth

Caixa Bank 4/8 (Financial Services Company, “Why is trade declining in Asia?,” 8 April 2016, <http://www.caixabankresearch.com/en/-/a-que-se-debe-la-caida-del-comercio-en-asia-f4>, \**fc*)

The significant drop of 25.4% year-on-year recorded by Chinese exports in nominal terms last February illustrates the deterioration in international trade in emerging Asia. Specifically, and in real terms, this fell by almost 4% in 2015 in contrast to the 0.6% growth posted by total world trade.1 The pattern of growth from just a few years ago has therefore been broken, when trade in emerging Asian countries grew by an average annual rate of 10.9%, doubling the already solid 5.4% growth enjoyed by world trade (see the first graph).2 One of the questions raised by this change is whether it is temporary or due to factors of a structural nature. China joining the World Trade Organization in 2001 represented a watershed for the role played by emerging Asia in international trade. Thanks to its more open stance, a large value chain developed with China at its heart. The high degree of fragmentation of this chain brought about a sharp rise in trade flows between the region's countries3 and emerging Asia's share of total global trade flows, which in the 1990s had hardly grown from 6% to 8%, came close to 17% in 2010. Today the figure is around 19% and reaches 26% if we add the region's advanced economies (such as Japan and Korea), which also form part of this peculiar industrial and commercial structure.4 However, just as the boost provided by China was crucial for Asia's growth in trade in the first decade of the millennium, the transformations currently affecting the country go a long way to explaining the commercial slowdown in the region. In particular, Asian trade with China is facing a threefold problem. Firstly, the country has more fully integrated the production chain for its exports, lowering the demand for intermediate inputs from its neighbours. The slowdown in the Asian giant's domestic demand and greater share of the services sector as the country changes its production model are the other two elements resulting in weak Asian trade. This growth in services, much less tradable than the rest of the products, has come close to 11% year-on-year in the last three years compared with 4% for manufacturing (see the second graph).5 The structural nature of these three factors suggests that part of the slowdown in growth of Asian trade flows is not temporary. Moreover, in addition to this boom in services the region has also been affected by global financial volatility in the last few months which has been particularly intense in Asia due to doubts regarding China's growth. As this uncertainty diminishes trade flows will pick up again but we should not expect them to achieve the energy of the boom years in 2000-2007.

#### Trade declining now – low commodity prices and low growth figures.

Bailey 2/26 (Tom Bailey, Writer for World Finance, “A bad year for global trade,” World Finance, 26 February 2016, <http://www.worldfinance.com/markets/a-bad-year-for-global-trade>, \**fc*)

Newly released data shows world trade in 2015 saw its worst year since 2009, following the onset of the 2008 global crisis. According to a report by the CPB Netherlands Bureau of Economic Policy Analysis, the total value of world trade fell by 13.8 percent in 2015. When it came to world export values, emerging markets took the lead in terms of the biggest contraction, stading at -15.6 percent compared to the advanced economies 14.2 percent. Africa itself saw a fall in export values of -41.4 percent, while Central and Eastern Europe saw a decline of -29.4 percent. With declining commodity prices as the commodity, a fall in values of imports and exports was to be expected. These falling value figures have stoked fears around the health of the world economy. However, beyond such cyclical concerns, the figures for world trade volume – as opposed to value – point towards a potential structural change in the world economy. Although world trade volume in 2015 saw growth figures, they lagged behind world GDP growth. The year saw a growth of trade volumes by 2.5 percent, while the world economy grew by just over three percent. This trend – of volume growth figures accounting for less than GDP growth – is part of an ongoing trend, with trade volumes slowing in relation to GDP growth. Prior to the 2008 world economic crisis – heralded at the time as an era of globalisation – global trade volume grew at a faster rate than world GDP. However, since 2011, the opposite has been the case, with trade volumes growing inline with or, as has been the case in 2015, grown at a slower pace. This trend has led to some to question whether globalisation reaching its peak, or even starting to decline.

#### Trade slowing now – declines in shipping show low demand.

Gray 2/13 (Michael Gray, Editor for the New York Post with BA in English and Business from Brooklyn College, “Blame less trading for freight shipping’s harsh decline,” New York Post, 13 February 2016, <http://nypost.com/2016/02/13/blame-less-trading-for-freight-shippings-harsh-decline/>, \**fc*)

In a sign that the global economy is cratering, the Baltic Dry Index — the main sea freight index, tracking rates for ships carrying dry bulk commodities — extended its record decline last week on concerns that demand was falling fast. The index is a barometer for the health of the global economy and is used as a canary in the coal mine for recession. The Index’s downturn, along with the falling price of crude, have given Wall Street jitters about a potential recession. The Baltic Dry Index is down about 98 percent from its peak of 11,793 points in May 2008, marking its lowest level since the records began in 1985, Reuters reported. “Trade really is slowing. Bellwethers, from giant port operator DP World to the Association of American Railroads and purchasing-manager indexes worldwide, all point to decelerating volume. That bodes poorly for growth, but it is way too early to set alarms ringing outside the transport industry,” analyst Tim Worstall told the Wall Street Journal. Maersk, the world’s largest shipping container operator by capacity, reported an 84 percent plunge in 2015 profit after its oil unit was hit by lower energy prices, and its shipping-container division got squeezed in slower global trade. Shares fell the most in almost a year on the news Wednesday. The company posted a $182 million fourth-quarter loss, having reported a $655 million profit in the year-earlier quarter. Maersk Oil reported a net loss of $2.52 billion for the quarter, compared with a profit of $189 million a year ago. Group revenue fell 22 percent, to $9.13 billion. “Given our expectation that the oil price will remain at a low level for a longer period, we have impaired the value of a number of Maersk Oil’s assets,” said Chief Executive Nils Andersen. Last October, Maersk Lines said it would cut its head count by 4,000 over the next two years and is merging its Asia Pacific and North Asia regions. It also canceled options to buy six giant Triple-E ships. Industry executives said global container lines will mostly be in the red this year, with collective losses spiraling to $5 billion.

**Asia Pivot**

**Pivot 1nc**

\*\*\*Integrate stuff from Pivot DA

**TPP is key to the Asia pivot**

**Miller 14** - Scholl Chair in International Business at CSIS, and Paul Nadeau, program manager and research associate with the Scholl Chair at CSIS

(Scott, “TPP Is More than a Trade Agreement,” Jan 31 2014, http://csis.org/publication/tpp-more-trade-agreement)

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid made news this week when he said that “everyone would be well advised not to push (Trade Promotion Authority, TPA) right now.” Because trade agreements negotiated by the United States practically **require TPA to be concluded**, Senator Reid’s comments were described as “putting the brakes” on the President’s trade agenda until after the midterm elections in November.¶ Senator Reid’s comments should not have been surprising or even troubling. When asked if he would bring TPA to the Senate floor, Reid replied with “We’ll see,” leaving the possibility on the table. That trade critics are pleased with Senator Reid’s comments and that business groups are not isn’t news. President Obama expressed support for trade agreements during the State of the Union address, but not much more than a name-check and not enough to provide political cover to Democrats who might consider supporting TPA. With Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell and other Republicans openly advocating TPA, the issue was probably due to get some push-back from Democrats. Tactically, this makes sense because no Democrat in a contested seat (and Senator Reid has many to protect) for the November elections stands to gain from TPA or the deals that it would accelerate, chiefly the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP).¶ Who gains the most now from TPA and the resulting TPP agreement? The White House. This isn’t because of the immediate economic benefits to the United States, or because it provides a template for future large-scale, comprehensive trade agreements, or because the President has advanced the most ambitious trade agenda since the early 1990s.¶ **The White House needs TPA** because **the TPP is the “pivot to Asia.”** The military realignment is important, but the repositioning is mostly relative, driven by drawdowns in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Pivot is a political and economic realignment that aims to improve cooperation and integration among the **U**nited **S**tates and East Asia. Then-secretary of state Hillary Clinton said this explicitly in her Foreign Policy article, “America’s Pacific Century,” when she wrote “[O]pen markets in Asia provide the United States with unprecedented opportunities for investment, trade, and access to cutting-edge technology. Our economic recovery at home will depend on exports and the ability of American firms to tap into the vast and growing consumer base of Asia.” Military presence was only one out of the six courses of action that Secretary Clinton used to define the Asia Pivot, while the TPP is arguably the **key ingredient** of three (deepening America's relationships with rising powers, including China; engaging with regional multilateral institutions; expanding trade and investment). If solving the financial crisis and passing health care reform were President Obama’s key domestic policy victories, then the Asia Pivot is primed to be the area where he beneficially changes the course of U.S. foreign policy (the discussions with Iran are still too nascent to determine how far reaching they will become).¶ Today, there are tensions among Asia’s large powers, and the **U**nited **S**tates is likely **the single entity** that can influence the situation. The **U**nited **S**tates and Asia need each other and TPP is the vehicle that can functionally, economically, and politically help bind them together. The Members of Congress and staff that have drafted the TPA bill have put admirable effort into legislation. Trade negotiators working on TPP have been equally tireless. But TPP, and Asia, cannot wait forever. Many in Asia are already concerned that the Pivot was only superficial and that United States is already moving on. If TPA and TPP remain framed as a trade issue, with all of the political baggage that comes with that, the Administration risks putting TPP on ice for 2014.¶ Alternatively, the Administration can influence perceptions by framing the TPP as a strategic goal that will be the cornerstone of the Asia Pivot. This would **reassure U.S. partners in Asia** and answer domestic critics who argue that the Pivot lacks substance. Moreover, it would give the President an achievable goal in advance of his April trip to Asia.

**Nuclear war**

Asia pivot prevents great power war

**Hiatt 13**

(Fred, “editorial page editor of The Post. He writes editorials for the newspaper and a biweekly column that appears on Mondays. He also contributes to the PostPartisan blog. Hiatt has been with The Post since 1981. Earlier, he worked as a reporter for the Atlanta Journal and the Washington Star. At The Post, he covered government, politics, development and other issues in Fairfax County and statewide in Virginia, and later military and national security affairs on the newspaper’s national staff. From 1987 to 1990, he and his wife were co-bureau chiefs of The Post’s Tokyo bureau, and from 1991 to 1995 they served as correspondents and co-bureau chiefs in Moscow. He joined the editorial board in 1996 and became editorial page editor in 2000. He is the author of “The Secret Sun: A Novel of Japan,” which was published in 1992, as well as two books for children, “If I Were Queen of the World” (1997) and “Baby Talk ” (1999). “Asian tensions add urgency to Obama’s ‘pivot’” <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-02-10/opinions/37026174_1_kim-jong-eun-diaoyu-islands-young-leader>)

As President **Obama** ponders his second-term foreign policy, he **faces jihadists** spreading **across North Africa, Syria dissolving into chaos, Israelis and Palestinians further apart than ever, Iraq trending toward civil war, Afghanistan mired in corruption and Iran relentlessly accelerating its nuclear program. That may turn out to be the easy stuff**. In Asia, things could get really scary. Since he entered the White House, **Obama** has **wanted to shift** attention and **resources to the Pacific**. The biggest opportunities are there: economic growth, innovation, potential for cross-border investment and trade. **That the 21st century will be a Pacific century has become a cliche. The cliche may still prove out**. But rather suddenly, **the region of economic miracles has become a zone of frightening confrontation**. The **North Koreans are turning out videos depicting New York in flames. Chinese warships** have **fixed their weapon-targeting radar on a Japanese ship** and helicopter. **Quarrels** have **intensified between South Korea and Japan, North Korea and South Korea, China and the Philippines, India and China. Taiwan is always a possible flashpoint. Any one of these could drag the United States in.** The scariest development may be **in North Korea**, the world’s only hereditary prison camp, where the young leader — **the third-generation Kim — seems determined to expand and improve his nuclear arsenal until he becomes a genuine threat not only to South Korea and Japan but** to **the** **U**nited **S**tates **as well**. **Chinese officials are** said to be alarmed by his intransigence but **unwilling to try to rein him in, fearing even more** the **instability** that might result. Obama in his first term adopted a reasonable policy of ignoring North Korea as much as possible, while making clear that he would reciprocate if it became more accommodating. Kim Jong Eun, who is thought to be in his late 20s, could find ways to make that stance untenable. Meanwhile, **China’s increasing assertiveness discomfits neighbors throughout Southeast and East Asia**. **China** has **claimed pretty much the whole South China Sea**, though its coastline is farther from much of it than that of Vietnam, Malaysia or the Philippines**.** **It** has **sent planes and ships to challenge Japan over a few rocky outcroppings that Japan calls the Senkakus** and China the Diaoyu Islands. **It has been steadily increasing the size and capability of its military forces**; for the first time in many years, **a neighbor, Japan, is following suit**. If all this seems decidedly last century, maybe it’s because new leaders in every key country are second- or third-generation, bearing the burdens of their past. Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is the grandson of a leader of imperial Japan—including in occupied China — who remade himself as a pro-American prime minister after World War II. South Korea’s president-elect, Park Geun-hye, is the daughter of a longtime president; her mother was killed by a devotee of North Korea. (The bullet was intended for her father, who was later assassinated by his intelligence chief.) Xi Jinping, China’s new president, is the son of a revolutionary colleague of Mao Tsetung who helped battle the Japanese during World War II. North Korea’s Kim Jong Eun is the grandson of Kim Il-sung, who according to North Korean mythology fought the Japanese in the 1930s and 1940s and the Americans and South Koreans in the 1950s. **It’s intriguing to speculate on the ghostly whisperings** these **leaders** may **hear. It may be more useful**, though, **to focus on the national weaknesses that may propel them to act. North Korea is a failed and hungry state for which blackmail** and bluster **have long been the only survival strategy**. **China is a rising** **power** and a growing economy — but **led by a one-party regime that may be tempted to use nationalism** **to distract a restive population from domestic troubles.** **Japan has discarded one prime minister after another**, pretty much **on an annual basis**, for most of the past decade, **an instability that leaves it punching below its economic and military weight. All of this makes the region hungry for U.S. presence and leadership**, **which Obama understood with his first-term promise of a “pivot” to Asia**. Regional leaders hope he can make good on that promise in a second term but wonder whether U.S. policy, too, will be shaped by political weakness. They notice when the Navy announces that it is, again, reducing its planned number of ships or Defense Secretary Leon Panetta orders an aircraft carrier kept in port because of budgetary constraints. They wonder who will inherit the Asia focus of former secretary of state Hillary Rodham Clinton and departing assistant secretary Kurt Campbell. **They see the dangers**, from Mali to Kandahar, **that pull Obama’s attention. They hope it won’t take a more dangerous crisis in their region to make the pivot a reality.**

**Nuclear war**

\*most probable

**Campbell 8** (Kurt M, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Dr. Campbell served in several capacities in government, including as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asia and the Pacific, Director on theNational Security Council Staff, previously the Chief Executive Officer and co-founder of the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), served as Director of the Aspen Strategy Group and the Chairman of the Editorial Board of the Washington Quarterly, and was the founder and Principal of StratAsia, a strategic advisory company focused on Asia, rior to co-founding CNAS, he served as Senior Vice President, Director of the International Security Program, and the Henry A. Kissinger Chair in National Security Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, doctorate in International Relation Theory from Oxford, former associate professor of public policy and international relations at the John F. Kennedy School of Government and Assistant Director of the Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard University, member of Council on Foreign Relations and  International Institute for Strategic Studies, “The Power of Balance: America in iAsia” June 2008, <http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CampbellPatelSingh_iAsia_June08.pdf>)

Asian *investment* is also at record levels. Asian countries lead the world with unprecedented infra­structure projects. With over $3 trillion in foreign currency reserves, Asian nations and businesses are starting to shape global economic activity. Indian firms are purchasing industrial giants such as Arcelor Steel, as well as iconic brands of its once-colonial ruler, such as Jaguar and Range Rover. China’s Lenovo bought IBM’s personal computer We call the transformations across the Asia-Pacific the emergence of “iAsia” to reflect the adoption by countries across Asia of fundamentally new stra­tegic approaches to their neighbors and the world. Asian nations are pursuing their interests with real power in a period of both tremendous potential and great uncertainty. iAsia is: *Integrating:* iAsia includes increasing economic interdependence and a flowering of multinational forums to deal with trade, cultural exchange, and, to some degree, security. *Innovating:* iAsia boasts the world’s most successful manufacturing and technology sectors and could start taking the lead in everything from finance to nanotech to green tech. *Investing:* Asian nations are developing infrastruc­ture and human capital at unprecedented rates. But the continent remains plagued by: Insecurity: Great-power rivalry is alive in Asia. Massive military investments along with historic suspicions and contemporary territorial and other conflicts make war in Asia plausible. Instability: From environmental degradation to violent extremism to trafficking in drugs, people, and weapons, Asian nations have much to worry about. *Inequality:* Within nations and between them, inequality in Asia is more stark than anywhere else in the world. Impoverished minorities in countries like India and China, and the gap in governance and capacity within countries, whether as back­ward as Burma or as advanced as Singapore, present unique challenges. A traditional approach to Asia will not suffice if the United States is to both protect American interests and help iAsia realize its potential and avoid pitfalls. business and the Chinese government, along with other Asian financial players, injected billions in capital to help steady U.S. investment banks such as Merrill Lynch as the American subprime mortgage collapse unfolded. Chinese investment funds regional industrialization, which in turn creates new markets for global products. Asia now accounts for over 40 percent of global consumption of steel 4 and China is consuming almost half of world’s available concrete. 5 Natural resources from soy to copper to oil are being used by China and India at astonishing rates, driving up commodity prices and setting off alarm bells in Washington and other Western capitals. Yet Asia is not a theater at peace. On average, between 15 and 50 people die every day from causes tied to conflict, and suspicions rooted in rivalry and nationalism run deep. The continent harbors every traditional and non-traditional challenge of our age: it is a cauldron of religious and ethnic tension; a source of terror and extrem­ism; an accelerating driver of the insatiable global appetite for energy; the place where the most people will suffer the adverse effects of global climate change; the primary source of nuclear proliferation; and the **most likely theater on Earth** for a major conventional confrontation and even a nuclear conflict. Coexisting with the optimism of iAsia are the ingredients for internal strife, non-traditional threats like terrorism, and traditional interstate conflict, which are all **magnified by the risk of miscalculation or poor decision-making**.

**TPP Solves Pivot**

**TPP which solidifies the Asia Pivot**

**Goodman, Simon Chair in Political Economy at CSIS, 13** (Matthew, December, “economics and the rebalance,” http://csis.org/files/publication/131220\_Global\_Economics\_Monthly\_v2issue12.pdf, accessed 1-22-14, CMM)

Economics is at the heart of U.S. involvement in the Asia Pacific.¶ This statement is as true today as it was in 1784, when the first¶ U.S. merchant ship bound for Canton set sail from New York. Trade,¶ investment, and other economic ties across the Pacific today are¶ measured in the trillions of dollars, support millions of American¶ jobs, and underpin our national security.¶ Like administrations before it, the Obama administration has¶ put economics at the center of its Asia-Pacific strategy. But it has¶ arguably raised the stakes by making the overall success of its¶ policy of “rebalancing” to Asia contingent on a successful economic¶ strategy, in particular completion of a high-standard Trans-Pacific¶ Partnership (TPP) trade agreement.¶ The economic leg of the rebalance is driven by three broad objectives:¶ promoting growth and jobs, upholding and updating the rules of the¶ international trading system, and supporting America’s long-term presence in the region. It is worth noting that¶ these objectives get to both sides of the coin regarding the relationship between economics and foreign policy:¶ using diplomatic tools to support better economic outcomes, such as more growth and jobs; and—arguably more¶ challenging—using economic tools in a strategic way to support foreign policy objectives, such as strengthening¶ the rules and supporting our presence in the region.¶ In pursuit of these objectives, the Obama administration has used a multilayered approach to economic engagement¶ in the Asia Pacific. This has bilateral, regional, and global strands, from the Strategic & Economic Dialogue with¶ China, to TPP and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, to the G-20, half of whose members are¶ Asia-Pacific countries. And it encompasses all aspects of economic policy, including promotion of strong domesticdemand-¶ led growth in large Asian surplus economies; negotiation of bilateral investment treaties; and strategic¶ use of development assistance.¶ But trade—and TPP in particular—is the **sharp end of the spear** when it comes to Obama economic strategy in¶ Asia. Through TPP, the administration seeks to advance all three objectives mentioned above, with an accent¶ on updating the rules. TPP aims to establish disciplines on an array of behind-the-border impediments, such¶ as excessive or nontransparent regulation; preferences for domestic, especially state-owned, enterprises; and¶ inadequate intellectual property protection. The administration’s aim appears to be making a successful TPP the¶ driver and de facto template for a new multilateral system of rules.¶ Failure to reach a TPP deal at this month’s ministerial meeting in Singapore was disappointing but not fatal. Trade¶ talks are always darkest—and noisiest—before the dawn, as differences are narrowed to the most politically¶ contentious issues. There are still grounds for optimism that a basic TPP deal can be reached by the time of¶ President Obama’s planned trip to Asia next April.¶ The stakes could not be higher for the White House.¶ Conclusion of TPP is the sine qua non of success for the¶ Asia rebalancing strategy. In addition to its economic¶ benefits, a successful agreement would anchor the¶ United States more firmly in the Asia Pacific and¶ bolster American leadership there. Without TPP, the¶ rebalance would contain little of substance that is¶ new and would be perceived in the region as driven¶ primarily by military considerations.¶ The U.S. Congress can support the economic leg of the¶ rebalance in several important ways. First, enacting¶ trade promotion authority legislation would give the¶ administration the guidance and certainty it needs¶ to close a high-standard TPP deal; without TPA, it¶ is difficult to see how the Office of the U.S. Trade¶ Representative (USTR) can persuade its counterparts¶ that it can fulfill its end of the bargain.

**Pivot Solves**

**Pivot prevents nuclear war**

**Colby 11** – Elbridge Colby, research analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, served as policy advisor to the Secretary of Defense’s Representative to the New START talks, expert advisor to the Congressional Strategic Posture Commission, August 10, 2011, “Why the U.S. Needs its Liberal Empire,” The Diplomat, online: http://the-diplomat.com/2011/08/10/why-us-needs-its-liberal-empire/2/?print=yes

But the pendulum shouldn’t be allowed to swing too far toward an incautious retrenchment. For our problem hasn’t been overseas commitments and interventions as such, but the kinds of interventions. The US alliance and partnership structure, what the late William Odom called the United States’ ‘liberal empire’ that includes a substantial military presence and a willingness to use it in the defence of US and allied interests, remains a vital component of US security and global stability and prosperity. This system of voluntary and consensual cooperation under US leadership, particularly in the security realm, constitutes a formidable bloc defending the liberal international order.¶ But, in part due to poor decision-making in Washington, this system is under strain, particularly in East Asia, where the security situation has become tenser even as the region continues to become the centre of the global economy.¶ A nuclear North Korea’s violent behaviour threatens South Korea and Japan, as well as US forces on the peninsula; Pyongyang’s development of a road mobile Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, moreover, brings into sight the day when North Korea could threaten the United States itself with nuclear attack, a prospect that will further imperil stability in the region.¶ More broadly, the rise of China – and especially its rapid and opaque military build-up – combined with its increasing assertiveness in regional disputes is troubling to the United States and its allies and partners across the region. Particularly relevant to the US military presence in the western Pacific is the development of Beijing’s anti-access and area denial capabilities, including the DF-21D anti-ship ballistic missile, more capable anti-ship cruise missiles, attack submarines, attack aircraft, smart mines, torpedoes, and other assets.¶ While Beijing remains a constructive contributor on a range of matters, these capabilities will give China the growing power to deny the United States the ability to operate effectively in the western Pacific, and thus the potential to undermine the US-guaranteed security substructure that has defined littoral East Asia since World War II. Even if China says today it won’t exploit this growing capability, who can tell what tomorrow or the next day will bring?¶ Naturally, US efforts to build up forces in the western Pacific in response to future Chinese force improvements must be coupled with efforts to engage Beijing as a responsible stakeholder; indeed, a strengthened but appropriately restrained military posture will enable rather than detract from such engagement. ¶ In short, the United States must increase its involvement in East Asia rather than decrease it. Simply maintaining the military balance in the western Pacific will, however, involve substantial investments to improve US capabilities. It will also require augmented contributions to the common defence by US allies that have long enjoyed low defence budgets under the US security umbrella. This won’t be cheap, for these requirements can’t be met simply by incremental additions to the existing posture, but will have to include advances in air, naval, space, cyber, and other expensive high-tech capabilities.¶ Yet such efforts are vital, for East Asia represents the economic future, and its strategic developments will determine which country or countries set the international rules that shape that economic future. Conversely, US interventions in the Middle East and, to a lesser degree, in south-eastern Europe have been driven by far more ambitious and aspirational conceptions of the national interest, encompassing the proposition that failing or **illiberally governed peripheral states** can contribute to an instability that nurtures terrorism and impedes economic growth. Regardless of whether this proposition is true, the effort is rightly seen by the new political tide **not** to be **worth the benefits gained**. Moreover, the United States can scale (and has scaled) back nation-building plans in Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Balkans without undermining its vital interests in ensuring the free flow of oil and in preventing terrorism.¶ The lesson to be drawn from recent years is not, then, that the United States should scale back or shun overseas commitments as such, but rather that we must be more discriminating in making and acting upon them. A total US unwillingness to intervene would pull the rug out from under the US-led structure, leaving the international system prey to disorder at the least, and at worst to chaos or dominance by others who could not be counted on to look out for US interests.¶ We need to focus on making the right interventions, not forswearing them completely. In practice, this means a more substantial focus on East Asia and the serious security challenges there, and less emphasis on the Middle East. ¶ This isn’t to say that the United States should be unwilling to intervene in the Middle East. Rather, it is to say that our interventions there should be more tightly connected to concrete objectives such as protecting the free flow of oil from the region, preventing terrorist attacks against the United States and its allies, and forestalling or, if necessary, containing **nuclear proliferation** as opposed to the more idealistic aspirations to transform the region’s societies. ¶ These more concrete objectives can be **better** met by the more judicious and economical use of our military power. More broadly, however, it means a shift in US emphasis away from the greater Middle East toward the Asia-Pacific region, which dwarfs the former in economic and military potential and in the dynamism of its societies. The Asia-Pacific region, with its hard-charging economies and growing presence on the global stage, is where the future of the international security and economic system will be set, and it is there that Washington needs to focus its attention, especially in light of rising regional security challenges. ¶ In light of US budgetary pressures, including the hundreds of billions in ‘security’ related money to be cut as part of the debt ceiling deal, it’s doubly important that US security dollars be allocated to the most pressing tasks – shoring up the US position in the most important region of the world, the **Asia**-Pacific. It will also **require restraint** in expenditure on those challenges and regions that don’t touch so directly on the future of US security and prosperity. ¶ As Americans debate the proper US global role in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis and Iraq and Afghanistan, they would do well to direct their ire not at overseas commitments and intervention as such, but rather at those not tied to core US interests and the sustainment and adaptation of the ‘liberal empire’ that we have constructed and maintained since World War II.¶ Defenders of our important overseas links and activities should clearly distinguish their cause from the hyperactive and barely restrained approach represented by those who, unsatisfied with seeing the United States tied down in three Middle Eastern countries, seek intervention in yet more, such as Syria. Indeed, those who refuse to scale back US interventions in the Middle East or call for still more are directly contributing to the weakening of US commitments in East Asia, given strategic developments in the region and a sharply constrained budgetary environment in Washington.¶ We can no longer afford, either strategically or financially, to squander our power in unnecessary and ill-advised interventions and nation-building efforts. The ability and will to intervene is too important to be so wasted.

**Deforestation Impact**

**Defo 1nc**

**TPP sovles defo**

**Meltzer 14** - Fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution and adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies

(Joshua, “The Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, the environment and climate change,” Scholar

The TPP presents an important opportunity to develop rules that support efforts to conserve forests and prevent trade in illegal logs in a region that is responsible for ‘the most intense deforestation in the world, with devastating and irreparable effects on its, and the world’s forests and ecosystems’.40 US policy on combating trade in illegally harvested timber is based on the 2008 Lacey Act Amendments, which extended the Act’s original prohibition on trade in wildlife and plants native to the US that have been illegally taken and listed in CITES, to include timber illegally harvested in other countries and imported into the US.41 Whether timber has been illegally harvested is determined according to the laws of the country of harvest. Under the Lacey Act Amendments, the importer is required to declare the value and quantity of the timber, the plant’s name, and its country of origin. The Lacey Act Amendments are a novel approach to addressing trade in illegally harvested timber products as they rely on the laws in the country of origin as determining whether an illegal harvest has occurred. And requiring TPP parties to fulfil their obligations under these MEAs, which include CITES, uses this treaty’s internationally agreed understanding of which species of flora are endangered as a common starting point amongst TPP parties for determining which timber should be protected.42 Moreover, placing responsibility on the importer to declare to US customs the wood type and country of export, alongside criminal penalties for knowingly making a false declaration, creates a strong incentive for the importer to source their wood from legally harvested timber products. Reducing the access of illegally harvested wood to the US market should reduce the commercial incentive for illegal logging. The Lacey Act also implicitly recognises that the challenge to addressing illegal logging is less about the need for better conservation laws and more about the effective enforcement by wood-exporting countries of their current laws. In fact, efforts to regulate logging since the 1980s have led to increased illegal logging in TPP countries, such as Malaysia.43 Consistent with this policy, the US has pursued international cooperation with other countries that emphasises exchanging information about trade in illegal logs and enhancing the capacity of law enforcement agencies in these countries. For instance, the US and Indonesia have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) under which their customs authorities have agreed to share information on trade in timber products and to cooperate in enforcing laws affecting trade in timber products.44 In 2009, this approach to international cooperation was expanded to an Asia-Pacific Initiative on Illegal Logging and Trade, which includes all the TPP countries in the Asia-Pacific region (except for New Zealand) and those TPP countries in the Western Hemisphere. Additionally, in 2011, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Trade Ministers directed their officials to find ways to address trade in illegally harvested timber products, leading APEC to create an Experts Group on Illegal Logging and Associated Trade tasked with developing ways to achieve this goal.45 This work has set the scene for including the type of information- sharing and law enforcement cooperation outlined above in the TPP and would continue an approach that all TPP parties have become engaged with in other fora. The most controversial element to date has been the US insistence that the commitments are mandatory and subject to dispute settlement, which is a step further than the voluntary nature of APEC and the US- Indonesia MOU, which does not have a binding dispute settlement mechanism.46

**Defo collapses global fungus populations**

**SEE 99**

(Satellites Events Enterprises, “Effects of Deforestation,” http://www.theguardians.com/Microbiology/gm\_mbr10.htm)

Conversely, soil can be baked by the sun. One consequence is that the important mycorrhizal fungi are destroyed by dehydration. The fungi live in a symbiotic relationship with trees, and every rainforest tree species may have its own, very specialized, fungal species associated with it. These unique fungi enable the tree to absorb more minerals from the soil than it would otherwise be able to, in exchange for energy. These fungi are similar to those associated with mushrooms, that are commonly found in temperate forests. In both instances, most of the fungus is in tiny filaments that surround the tree's roots. When the mycorrhizal fungi are not present, the trees cannot grow. In deforested areas, **fungi will not grow** in the warmer and drier soil that results when the forest canopy is removed. The degraded soil is taken over by coarse grasses and other hardy species.

**Extinction**

**Minter 10** – PhD, Chair of IUCN's Cup Fungi

(Dr David Minter, Truffles and their Allies Specialist Group, A future for fungi - the orphans of Rio, 06 October 2010 http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/news/opinion/?6197/A-future-for-fungi---the-orphans-of-Rio)

It's difficult to over-emphasize how important fungi are, writes Dr David Minter, Chair of IUCN’s intriguingly-named Cup Fungi, Truffles and their Allies Specialist Group. Their well-being is **necessary for sustainable life on this planet**. Without them, we're finished. To take just one example, they are nature's recyclers. Like the municipal refuse collectors employed to remove our rubbish, we don't notice them until for some reason they stop. But—and it's scary—stopping is something they might just possibly do. Scientists have known for over 100 years that, like animals and plants, fungi too are affected by the destructive activities of mankind. There is already evidence that populations of many species are falling: the impact of air pollution on lichen-forming fungi is particularly well documented. Although there is still insufficient information about the conservation status of fungi, there is every reason to suppose they are just as vulnerable as other groups of organisms to habitat loss and climate change. Misleading descriptions Public awareness of their importance is, however, very low, not least because biodiversity—the full and wonderful diversity of life—is still widely portrayed as ‘flora and fauna’ or ‘animals and plants’. These lazy and misleading descriptions can even be found on websites of major biological institutions and learned societies which should and do know better. Biodiversity is so much more than ‘animals and plants’. The five kingdom classification of life, which recognizes fungi in a kingdom of their own, has been generally accepted by scientists since at least 1970 and, with an estimated 1.5 million species of fungi on this planet and a presence in all major ecosystems--freshwater, marine and terrestrial alike, this kingdom is megadiverse. There are far more fungi than all the plants and vertebrates put together. To ignore them is not a sensible option. The broader conservation movement, however, remains largely unaware of the need to conserve fungi. Priority habitats for conservation, such as ‘biodiversity hotspots’, are almost always defined on the basis of bird, mammal and flowering plant diversity. Fungi don't get a look-in. This means that habitats rich in fungal diversity are missed and remain unprotected. Most nature reserve management plans do not take fungi into account. Fungi are often treated as part of the problem, rather than recognized as themselves being in need of protection. In many countries there is no explicit legal protection for fungi.

**Japan Impact**

**TPP failure wrecks US-Japan relations**

**Goto 9/6**

Shihoko Goto is the Northeast Asia associate of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars' Asia Program in Washington. She was formerly senior business correspondent at United Press International.

http://www.upi.com/Top\_News/Analysis/Outside-View/2013/09/06/Outside-View-The-trade-deal-that-cant-afford-to-be-derailed/UPI-62561378440180/#ixzz2e7vbOD00

WASHINGTON, Sept. 6 (UPI) -- **Time is running out for what would be the world's biggest trade deal to be clinched on time.**¶ While rumblings of the possibility of the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement not meeting its October deadline grow stronger, politics must not pre-empt the United States or Japan from stalling the momentum forward. The price to pay for the two biggest countries in the 12-country talks to walk away from TPP **would be too great** for both.¶ Cautious optimism about the global economic outlook prevails, not least at the latest Group of 20 summit in St. Petersburg, Russia. With the worst of Europe's financial crisis seemingly behind, economic concerns now focus on U.S. monetary policy and international tax codes but most attention will be focused on Syria.¶ Yet this is hardly the time to lose sight of the momentum that could further open markets worldwide. With the United States looking into signing a landmark trade pact with Europe under the auspices of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, it is in Asia's best interest to ensure that TPP is successful.¶ In concluding the latest round of TPP negotiations in Brunei Aug. 30, the U.S. Trade Representative's office stated that officials from Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam as well as the United States still look "to conclude this landmark agreement this year," even as a slew of highly sensitive issues including opening dairy and auto markets, not to mention the sparring of pharmaceutical companies and tackling environmental regulations, being part of the mix.¶ But while the urgency to conclude what would be the world's most ambitious trade deal yet should be felt by Japan, it is in the United States' interest too for the October deadline to be met.¶ Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe certainly has staked his political future into the success of TPP and, to date, the gamble has paid off.¶ Declaring that "if Japan alone should become inward-looking, we would have no chance of growth," Abe stated that TPP would also "significantly contribute to the security of our country and also to the stability of the Asia-Pacific region."¶ Joining the pact is a key part of his economic policy now known as "Abenomics," that looks to press ahead with structural reform that would include lowering tariffs on politically sensitive sectors including rice, which could obliterate some of Japan's most powerful farming groups.¶ The cost of TPP failing or even being watered down, however, would be far more damaging than the wrath of any single interest group, even the most powerful ones.¶ Massive debt, aging population, lackluster entrepreneurial incentives and energy challenges are but a few of the fundamental problems facing Japan that require the country to be an integral part of the global economy.¶ With China's ever-growing economic might on the one hand and Japan's seemingly continued slide on the economic ladder on the other, becoming a key player in the world's biggest trade deal to date would certainly enhance its standing in the global arena as it sits at the table to decide trade rules that will impact international markets over the next decades.¶ Equally important too would be **an enhancement of Japan's relations with the United States.** While South Korea concluded a bilateral free trade agreement with the United States in 2011, Tokyo has yet to sign an FTA with Washington. As such, the TPP agreement would effectively take place instead of a bilateral agreement between Japan and the United States.¶ Still, it is not only Japan that needs TPP. The United States too would be losing a tremendous opportunity to engage more actively with the Asia-Pacific region.¶ Granted, the treaty has caused outrage in certain sectors, most notably in the automobile industry. U.S. carmakers have clamored for tariffs on Japanese cars to be phased out only gradually, with the American Automotive Policy Council estimating that it would cost U.S. automakers $1 billion and about 100,000 U.S. jobs should tariffs be dropped immediately.¶ It goes without saying that certain industries in all TPP member countries will be particularly vulnerable to the competition and higher regulatory standards imposed by the trade pact. Yet the sheer size and ambition of the agreement also means that the United States would have a unique foothold in the Asia-Pacific region should it go through as planned.¶ With China's absence in the agreement, the United States will undoubtedly be the single most influential economy that will have a tremendous voice in shaping trade rules some of the world's most robust countries. Failure to play an active role in developing and implementing the framework would ultimately hurt the economic future of the United States.¶ Much rides on the success of the next round of talks in Bali, Indonesia, next month during the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation meeting. Losing that momentum would have far greater consequences to the global economy as well as political stability worldwide than simply opening up markets on both sides of the Pacific.

**A strong US-Japanese alliance prevents multiple nuclear wars**

**Armitage 00**

Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of State, 10-11-00, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/press/Spelreprts/SRJAPAN.HTM “The United States and Japan: Advancing Toward a Mature Partnership”, ACC: 9.11.04, p. online.

Major war in Europe is inconceivable for at least a generation, but the prospects for conflict in Asia are far from remote. The region features some of the world’s largest and most modern armies, nuclear-armed major powers, and several nuclear-capable states. Hostilities that could directly involve the United States in a major conflict could occur at a moment’s notice on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. The Indian subcontinent is a major flashpoint. In each area, war has the potential of nuclear escalation. In addition, lingering turmoil in Indonesia, the world’s fourth-largest nation, threatens stability in Southeast Asia. The United States is tied to the region by a series of bilateral security alliances that remain the region’s de facto security architecture. / In this promising but also potentially dangerous setting, the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship is more important than ever. With the world’s second-largest economy and a well-equipped and competent military, and as our democratic ally, Japan remains the keystone of the U.S. involvement in Asia. The U.S.-Japan alliance is central to America’s global security strategy.

**Turns Case**

**T/Leadership**

#### Delay causes US leadership collapse - severely weakens influence in the region

**Needham** **6/21** - reporter for The Hill (Vicki Needham, June 21, 2016, “White House ramping up pressure on Congress to pass TPP this year”, http://thehill.com/policy/finance/trade/284340-white-house-ramping-up-pressure-on-congress-to-pass-tpp-this-year)//SB

"Delayed passage of TPP would severely weaken our leadership, and with that, would have widespread strategic implications," Froman said at the Rand Corporation breakfast.∂ Froman said Monday that the White House is mobilizing to sell the TPP to lawmakers over the next several months in a effort that could eclipse last summer's successful bid to pass trade promotion authority.∂ "We can pass TPP or be remembered as the generation that imposed a self-inflicted wound on American influence and American leadership around the world. And that doesn’t strike me as a difficult choice," Froman said. ∂ "For all these reasons, it is imperative that we make TPP a reality, and soon," he said. ∂ "It’s a tough political environment but trade votes have always been tough."∂ TPP is facing numerous hurdles from anti-TPP rhetoric on the presidential campaign trail to opposition from congressional Democrats and labor unions.∂ In addition, trade leaders on Capitol Hill have expressed concern about several issues from the treatment of tobacco to the length of intellectual property protection for high-tech medicines.

**T/Kritik**

**Globalization creates global value convergence that works toward fighting structural violence**

**Seita**, Law Professor at Albany, **’97** (Alex, “Globalization and the Convergence of Values” Cornell International Law Journal, lexis)

Law has been important in managing economic globalization and may become as important with respect to political globalization. 7 The ideology of globalization can be broadly divided into substantive and procedural components. The most important procedural element is the rule of law - the idea that disputes will be settled and agreements negotiated through the observance of established principles rather than the use of force or the intimidation of power. 8 In turn, the substantive principles, what the rule of law seeks to enforce, are those that nations have selected to settle disputes and negotiate agreements. The rule of law can be a way of resolving conflicts effectively, peacefully, and cooperatively. Furthermore, globalization enhances the perceived importance of distant international problems relative to local problems. Thus, protection of the environment beyond national borders has attracted strong international support, and the conflict between environment protection and economic development created the global issue of sustainable development. 9 [\*431] On the downside, technology together with economic and political globalization can facilitate the movement of criminal and terrorist activities across national boundaries and help criminals and terrorists to operate like efficient international businesses. 10 Most significantly for this Article, however, globalization is an important source of common economic and political values for humanity. Globalization is simultaneously a cause and a consequence of the convergence of basic economic and political systems among nations. As the activities of globalization help to converge economic and political systems, their existence reciprocally facilitates the expansion of globalization. Momentously, the convergence of these systems is leading to the convergence of fundamental values - deeply held beliefs about what is right and wrong. 11 There is a widespread, though not universal, acceptance among nations of the basic values of liberal democracy: a market economy (or free markets), a democratic government, and the protection of human rights. Although particular details may differ from country to country, the general nature of these values is the same. The convergence of basic economic and political values among nations is a pivotal event because it is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for the eventual emergence of a consensus among human beings that there is but one human race. 12 This Article argues that the United States and the other industrialized democracies (e.g., the members of the European Union, Japan, and Canada), collectively referred to as the "West," 13 should vigorously support and substantially guide the process of globalization. As it is currently emerging, globalization fosters desirable common national values by advancing general forms of market economies, democracy, and human rights. 14 It is precisely those general characteristics of liberal democracy that constitute the foundational pillars and shared values of the United States and the other industrialized democracies. 15 Because the exact form of globalization is not a fixed certainty, the United States and the other industrialized democracies should aggressively configure globalization to be consistent with and to promote the values of liberal democracy. The industrialized democracies must also ensure that the path of globalization fairly balances the values of free market economics, democracy, and human rights, while accommodating such vital concerns as the protection of the environment, concerns that do not yet generate as strong a global consensus as the three convergent values. 16 The mechanism for configuring globalization to conform to and to balance the values of liberal democracy consists of events and policies that, while difficult to achieve, are not unrealistic and have, to a degree, already been occurring. 17 A particularly useful event might be a catharsis that would place the world into the next millennium without the baggage of the past. Perhaps by the year 2001, the representatives of oppressors, victims, victors, losers, and adversaries could assemble on a world stage in a therapeutic ceremony to put the past behind. 18 Given their economic preeminence in the world, by acting in unison the industrialized democracies should be able to determine the specific content of globalization. Action from the industrialized democracies is needed because a humane globalization will increase human wealth and reduce human suffering. 19 Morally, the promotion of liberal democratic values and the perspective of a single human race would serve to repay the historic debts that the industrialized countries have incurred over the past centuries. 20 At the same time, the industrialized democracies must be careful to use their influence responsibly and sensitively, for the wisest ideas pursued for the best motives may be rejected when unilaterally imposed upon the rest of the world. Perceived economic and political "imperialism," though much less malevolent than military imperialism, will not be warmly greeted. The primary vehicle for the industrialized democracies should be the "rule of law" - assuming that they have a substantial, if not commanding voice in determining its underlying principles. An enlightened globalization will not lead to the establishment of a world government. It could, however, create a new attitude among human beings and serve the interests of the United States. 21 More profoundly, advancing globalization will facilitate an event barely begun that holds the great potential of constructing, in the distant future, the perspective that the human race matters more than its component divisions along race, religion, or ethnicity. The vision of a common humanity is reason enough to embrace globalization. I. The Background of Globalization Today, more than ever, the events of foreign lands have important economic and political consequences for local inhabitants. To be sure, foreign events have had significant ramifications in the past. Centuries ago, seminal inventions in China revolutionized the culture, science, and warfare of Europeans; the opening of American borders to European immigrants from the 19th through the mid-20th centuries gave millions a new home; and the conflicts in Europe during WorldWarI eventually brought the United States onto the European battleground. 23 But these events were of sporadic importance. For example, after World War I ended, the United States isolated itself in a number of respects from international politics and trade; America declined membership in the League of Nations and enacted the Smoot-Hawley tariffs in 1931 which drastically reduced imports. 24 By contrast, transnational activities and affairs now have continuous importance, repeatedly affecting not just distant countries, but also the entire global community at times. The continuous importance of international events is a defining characteristic of globalization. Another feature of globalization with potentially profound implications is the convergence of basic economic and political values among nations towards the liberal democratic values of the industrialized democracies, the "West." 25 For the West, the liberal, democratic values of market [\*434] economies, democracy, and human rights are fundamental. 26 Given the arguably shallow roots of liberal democratic values in a number of countries and the absence of democracy and human rights in many others, this process may perhaps be too incomplete to be described as a convergence of [\*435] fundamental values. Nevertheless, today there are greater similarities between the economic and political systems of nations than at any other time in the short history of globalization. 27 With careful and generous support from the West, this similarity of systems may evolve into a similarity of fundamental values. A. Globalization's Beginning Identifying the birth of globalization is an elusive task, but one possible date is the year 1945, when the United States led the Allied powers in creating the United Nations and its companion international organizations, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). 28 Later in 1948, the United States and its democratic allies established the General Agreement on Tar- [\*436] iffs and Trade (GATT), another important economic institution for globalization along with the IMF and the World Bank. 29 The motivations for creating these international institutions were at once noble and selfish. After the devastating experience of World War II, the victorious Allies were determined to prevent any reoccurrence of similar world wars. Their motivating hope was that a collegial body of nations would ensure the peaceful resolution of conflicts and provide a collective defense against wrongful aggression. 30 Thus, the United Nations was the focus of political attempts to prevent future acts of aggression. Further, unlike the League of Nations, the United Nations made the promotion of human rights one of its basic purposes. 31 Toward that end, the United Nations created various human rights institutions and generated human rights conventions and [\*437] declarations. 32 At the same time, the Allies thought it critical to lay the foundations for the economic prosperity of the international community. 33 Prosperous countries, it was thought, would be less inclined to wage wars. Thus, the Allies promoted activities that would raise the standard of living among peaceful countries. For example, the Allies established international economic institutions which were in part created to promote international monetary cooperation (the IMF), to foster economic development in less developed countries (the World Bank), and to increase international trade (the GATT). 34 [\*438] The creation of the United Nations, the IMF, the World Bank, and the GATT were key moments in globalization. These institutions signaled the start of an era of cooperative behavior, however imperfect, among nations. While the number of nations involved was limited, their cooperation required the development and formal recognition of common interests. The GATT and the United Nations, in particular, were critical components in the genesis of globalization. 35 In seeking to reduce barriers to trade of goods, the GATT contained free market principles that favored lower tariffs, banned quotas, and prohibited discrimination against foreign goods. 36 The United Nations, at least on paper, championed the principles of human rights and democratic forms of government. 37 As these principles [\*439] gained international acceptance, economic and political norms developed. That is, common values emerged. B. Economic Globalization In current usage, the term globalization refers primarily to economic globalization. As barriers to trade, investment, financial flows, and technology transfers have fallen, there has been an expansion of markets for goods, services, financial capital, and intellectual property to transnational, regional, and even global dimensions. 38 There are several hallmarks of economic globalization. First, it increases opportunities for sellers as well as buyers. Second, economic globalization simultaneously creates new competition. Third, it develops interdependency among nations. Finally, economic globalization spreads the ideology of the free market economy model because the industrialized nations, the major promoters of globalization, advocate free market policies. The enlargement of markets beyond national boundaries means that both sellers and buyers have greater choices. More firms issue equity [\*440] securities in, or obtain financing from, international markets. 39 They also find it profitable to sell their goods and services in, or buy their raw materials or components from, international markets. Worldwide trade now amounts to an astonishingly large figure, six trillion dollars in 1995, more than 80% the size of the gross domestic product of the United States, the world's largest economy. 40 The existence of greater choice also extends to investment opportunities. Companies are investing in foreign countries, buying assets such as securities, businesses, facilities, and land, and have shifted production to [\*441] foreign factories. 41 Concurrently, sellers of such domestic assets now have [\*442] more buyers to choose from. The liberalization of investment opportunities - the removal of barriers - contributes to the liberalization of trade, and vice versa. 42 Expanding markets simultaneously generates more competition along with more opportunities; 43 domestic firms must compete not only with domestic but also foreign rivals. While benefiting domestic consumers, foreign competition may threaten domestic businesses and employees. 44 Whether the foreign competition comes from imports or the local subsidiaries of foreign corporations, employees of domestic firms may lose their jobs as these firms lay off surplus employees in order to become more competitive. 45 Where local subsidiaries of foreign corporations provide competition, however, these subsidiaries will create new jobs that replace, in [\*443] part, jobs lost at domestic firms. 46 One of the major consequences of increased foreign competition and the domestic drive for efficiency is that countries have become more willing to privatize and deregulate. 47 By making foreign countries important sources of consumers, investors, and suppliers, globalization creates interdependence. When domestic businesses buy from and sell to foreign markets, their financial welfare becomes linked to those markets. More domestic companies have evolved into multinational corporations, firms that have economic interests in several countries. Businesses set up partnerships with foreign firms, to share technology and risk, in order to create new products. 48 Because customers as well as suppliers are foreign, firms in one country become economically dependent upon firms in other countries. When foreign firms likewise become dependent upon domestic markets, interdependence is established as the economic prosperity of one nation becomes connected to that of other countries. For virtually all countries, transnational trade is important, if not vital, to their economic prosperity. 49 As economic globalization integrates various national markets into regional or world-wide markets, it also promotes general free market prin- [\*444] ciples, such as the quintessential concept of the market mechanism to allocate resources, 50 reduce protectionism in international trade, 51 and [\*445] privatize and deregulate. 52 Well before the collapse of the Soviet Union or even the end of the Cold War, the market economy (free market) paradigm of the West emerged as the decisive winner in the economic contest with the command (or planned) economy paradigm of the Soviet bloc. 53 Since globalization is being led by the corporations and governments in the capitalist economies of the industrialized democracies, it naturally advocates the ideology of the winners rather than the losers. Thus, the rules underlying globalization seek to expand markets among market economy rather than command economy principles. 54 For example, the WTO espouses the implementation of free-market ground rules to cover international trade and trade-related aspects of [\*446] investment and intellectual property. 55 n55. The IMF and the World Bank, too, have promoted market economy principles. See, e.g., James supra note 28, at 323 (IMF conditionality, the terms on which it will lend, has often required budgetary and domestic credit restraints, as well as trade liberalization); World Bank, The East Asian Miracle: Economic Growth and Public Policy 10 (1993) [hereinafter East Asian Miracle] (advocating a "market friendly" strategy in which "the appropriate role of government is to ensure adequate investments in people, provide a competitive climate for private enterprise, keep the economy open to international trade, and maintain a stable macroeconomy"); Barend A. de Vries, Remaking the World Bank 6, 56-58 (1987) (describing how the World Bank has encouraged decentralized planning rather than command-type central planning, and has made substantial loans to help borrowing nations increase their economies' efficiency and competitiveness, such as by liberalizing trade); cf. John Williamson, Introduction, in IMF Conditionality, supra note 34, at xiii (stating that one complaint of borrowing countries is that the IMF is "ideologically biased in favor of free markets and against socialism"). At this time, however, the WTO is the most important of the international economic institutions in carrying out the implementation of free market principles, primarily the idea of opening markets (liberalizing trade) among countries. The WTO agreements have gone beyond the GATT in covering trade in services as well as trade-related aspects of intellectual property and trade-related investment measures. See General Agreement on Trade in Services, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1B, 33 I.L.M. 44 (1994); Agreement on The Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property, Including Trade in Counterfeit Goods, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1C, 33 I.L.M. 81 (1994); Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures, Agreements on Trade in Goods, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1A, available in <http://itl.irv.uit.no/trade law/documents/freetrade> (visited Mar. 29, 1997). Further, the WTO agreements address more meaningfully the subjects of agriculture, textiles, and apparel. See Agreement on Agriculture, Agreements on Trade in Goods, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1A, available in <http://itl.irv.uit.no/trade law/documents/freetrade> (visited Mar. 29, 1997); Agreement on Textiles and Clothing, Agreements on Trade in Goods, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1A, available in <http://itl.irv.uit.no/trade law/documents/freetrade> (visited Mar. 29, 1997). Its rules go further than those of the GATT, its predecessor in carrying out the free market principle of comparative advantage by stamping out protectionism among nations. 56 When tools of protectionism - such as tariffs, quotas, or domestic subsidies - are reduced, foreign imports can better enter a domestic market, creating more competition for local firms. n56. For instance, the WTO makes a member's subsidy to its domestic industry actionable by another member if its effect "is to displace or impede the imports of a like product of another Member into the market of the subsidizing Member." Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, Agreements on Trade in Goods, Apr. 15, 1994, Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, Annex 1A, art. 6.3(a), available in <http://itl.irv.uit.no/trade law/documents/freetrade> (visited Mar. 29, 1997). The presence of increased competition contributes to the development of more efficient local firms as only the fittest firms will survive in a competitive marketplace. The use of a market and consumer choice, rather than a bureaucracy, to determine the survival of firms and products is the essence of a free market. 57 Not surprisingly, the various WTO agreements are expected to substantially [\*447] increase global income. 58 C. Political Globalization As economic globalization expands, it has been accompanied by a somewhat lesser degree of political globalization in that there are now substantial numbers of elected governments. 59 Also, the rhetoric of human rights has gained universal acceptance, and more nations than ever before have pledged to protect human rights. 60 With political globalization, there is [\*448] more than just the existence of elected governments and the recognition of human rights by governments. Political globalization has also tended to cause a convergence in political values, with the genuine acceptance of democracy and human rights in a greater number of countries. Compared to the convergence in economic values, the convergence of political values has had a more difficult path. The growth of economic globalization was championed by countries that realized they would gain economically by increased foreign trade. Even the command-economy communist nations sought trade with the capitalist economies of the West. 61 Well before the end of the Cold War, some communist nations even embraced capitalism to an extent. As events in China have clearly shown, dictatorship and a dismal human rights record have not been incompatible with free market policies. 62 Unlike economic globalization, the support for political globalization historically has been weak, perhaps because its benefits were not as obvious or immediate. Despite their long history predating free market principles, the political values of democracy and human rights have been more dishonored by breach than honored by observance. 63 Most countries did [\*449] not espouse them, and those that did applied these concepts selectively. 64 For decades after the end of World WarII, the spread of humanitarian political values had to contend with severe obstacles. 65 For much of the [\*450] existence of the United Nations, the most important international organization devoted to the promotion of democracy and human rights, many of its leading members either did not observe democratic values or human rights domestically, or subordinated these values to other priorities in foreign affairs. 66 Despite initial obstacles, however, these political values slowly developed roots in non-western countries. Even before the end of the Cold War, the past two decades saw the emergence of a greater number of countries with democratic governments and protective of human rights. 67 These countries offer political rights and [\*451] civil liberties that make them different in kind from past authoritarian regimes. With the end of the Cold War, many of the former Soviet-allied countries established popularly elected governments. Earlier, elected governments emerged from dictatorships in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. 68 As the transformation of South Africa - the former bastion of apartheid - into a democratic country shows, the unbelievable can happen. The outlook today is promising for the values of democracy and, to a lesser extent, human rights. First, with the triumph of liberal democracy over communism in the Cold War, 69 the United States and its allies can now more vigorously pursue humanitarian rather than security objectives. Second, the commonality of democracy and human rights in nations has provided more reason for these nations to cooperate among themselves in trade, humanitarian, and security matters, as well as in trying to nurture the qualities of democracy and human rights in authoritarian countries. The remaining authoritarian strongholds face pressures to democratize, and to recognize some level of human rights. 70 Democracy has been easier to achieve than the protection of human rights, perhaps because the implementation of democracy is technically more easily accomplished (e.g., a popularly elected government), while there may be disagreement over which rights are basic human rights and how these basic rights are to be protected. 71 Furthermore, elected governments need not necessarily protect human rights, especially in nascent [\*452] democracies which may have problems of illiteracy, corruption, authoritarian traditions, ethnic or religious conflicts, and a winner-takes-all political system. 72 The value of democratic governments is that their actions reflect the desires of a majority of the people rather than the wishes of a tyrant or a select few. Democracy is arguably the most basic human right because it recognizes the sovereignty of the people in that a government pursues policies which the majority of the people support through their freely elected representatives. The preferences of at least a majority of its population, rather than the desires of a select few, influence democratic governments. Democratic governments are much more likely to respect human rights, at least those of the majority, than authoritarian regimes which are unaccountable to an electorate. Of course, democracy is not itself a sufficient condition for a humane society, since a majority may persecute or subjugate a minority in a democratic society. 73 A practical benefit of mature democracies, those having democratic governments for a long period of time, is that they substantially protect a wide variety of human rights and are much less likely to use military force to resolve conflicts. 74 [\*453] Despite disagreement over the extent to which human rights should be protected, some level of human rights protection exists for a substantial percentage, if not the majority, of the world's population. 75 For an increasing number of countries, there seems to be a real, as opposed to a rhetorical, acceptance of some form of human rights. While inadequate and imperfect, this is an enormous improvement over the past. While outrageous examples of inhumanity still occur, such as in Rwanda, they are universally condemned. In an indirect way, the cultural impact of economic globalization stimulates political globalization. Economic globalization has long introduced aspects of foreign cultures - especially American culture - either directly by the sale of merchandise such as movies and musical recordings, or indirectly through exposure to foreigners. 77 More than in the past, the opening of new markets through economic globalization has brought a flood of people and companies into foreign lands. Personal contact, always so important in understanding other human beings, has made foreigners less inscrutable. More business personnel are assigned to overseas offices, more consumers travel abroad as tourists, and more students study in foreign countries. 78 Local residents are more likely than ever before to work for, do business with, or personally know foreigners. In some cases, this transnational encounter may lead to a personal affinity with or an in-depth understanding of foreign cultures. 79 [\*455] Further, economic globalization has generated an interest in learning foreign languages, primarily English. Perhaps irreversibly, English has become the international language of business and science, with a broader usage than any other language. 80 At the same time, the ability to speak a foreign language other than English gives one a competitive advantage in doing business in nonEnglish-speaking countries. 81 Doing business with foreigners, in their country or in one's own, requires that one communicate with them, cooperate with them, and be exposed to their political and business values. 82 The political values of democracy and human rights, as well as aspects of foreign cultures, are often inseparable (though secondary) components of economic globalization. Thus, countries that seek to benefit from economic globalization must frequently tolerate political globalization and exposure to foreign cultures. As people know more about foreign cultures, some familiarity with foreign political values is bound to arise. II. Technology's Vital Role in Converging Values The advanced communication technology that links much of the world together continues to be crucial to the convergence of economic and political values. This technology is utilized primarily by business entities to facilitate economic globalization. 83 Modern technology has also tended to promote democracy and human rights by making it easier and cheaper for [\*456] people to communicate without censorship across national boundaries. Communication technology not only exposes a national population to foreign ideas, but also concurrently exposes domestic conditions to a global audience. qThis has occurred because economic globalization involves communication technologies with multiple uses. The same technology that transmits a business proposal may also communicate politically embarrassing or other non-business information. These multiple uses of advanced technology cannot easily be separated from each other, making it difficult to restrict the technology to purely business purposes. A country that wishes to participate in international business cannot isolate itself from all uses of communication technologies unrelated to business dealings. 84 The internet 85 is a recent communication medium with tremendous potential for linking people across national boundaries, furthering mutual interests of the international community, and a myriad of other uses. 86 The internet will become, or may already be, an important or even critical technological medium for business, as well as for scientific research and consumer enjoyment. 87 The internet is the essential part of the "informa- [\*457] tion superhighway," a source of information that promises to change fundamentally human lives. 88 E-mail and computer file transmission on the internet can potentially provide a more powerful (e.g., faster, cheaper, more convenient) business tool than such conventional devices as the postal service, telephones, and faxes. Internet users can transmit and download data, articles, images, movies, speeches, sound recordings, and other information. 89 By providing a forum for the transfer of such information, the internet will help protect the freedoms of expression and choice for followers of any ideological persuasion. 90 Unfortunately, however, it may shield criminal, obscene, [\*458] racist, and terrorist activities as well. 91 A government might attempt to control the content of information transfers. It could screen large numbers of telephone calls, faxes, or computer data; it could restrict access to or intercept messages on the internet. Total censorship, however, would bring a halt to international business. 92 Firms might object if government surveillance is too pervasive. For example, companies might not want government officials to be privy to proprietary information. 93 A certain amount of freedom of communication is therefore assured if a country wishes to be part of a global economy: international firms will leave a nation if censorship prohibitively increases the cost of doing business. This will remain true even if governments attempt to censor communications using the most advanced and cost-effective surveillance technology available. 94 [\*459] Communication technologies not essential to international business transactions also serve to bolster humanitarian political values. International news reporting utilizes communication technologies to broadcast major domestic events of all types on a worldwide screen. There are numerous journalists, broadcasters, and commentators whose professional livelihood depends upon bringing newsworthy stories to a foreign, if not international, audience. While most publicized stories may not involve political events, many do. The competitive members of the news media are unlikely to let stories of outrageous acts completely escape the attention of the international public. Furthermore, these news articles may be read by anyone in the world who has access to the internet. 95 At the same time, news stories alone would not generate international repercussions against repressive governments if purely theoretical political values were involved. There must be influential constituencies that place high priority on the existence of democracy and human rights, that seek to spread those values, and that are galvanized into action upon news of deplorable political conditions. Neither value would flourish unless there were constituencies, either domestic or abroad, that strongly supported it. The presence of democratic governments and strong protections for human rights in the industrialized countries means that these values are expressed to some degree in their business transactions with other countries. 96 Sizable populations in the industrialized countries also attempt to support democracy and human rights abroad through private means. 97 Moreover, as the living standards of developing countries improve, the citizenry of these countries seem to expect more democratization (first) and [\*460] human rights (later). 98 III. The Importance of Globalization Because globalization promotes common values across nations and can make foreign problems, conditions, issues, and debates as vivid and captivating as national, state, and local ones, it contributes to a sense of world community. 99 It develops a feeling of empathy for the conditions of people abroad, enlarging the group of human beings that an individual will identify with. Globalization thus helps to bring alive persons in foreign lands, making them fellow human beings who simply live in different parts of the world rather than abstract statistics of deaths, poverty, and suffering. The convergence of basic political and economic values is thus fundamentally important because it helps to establish a common bond among people in different countries, facilitating understanding and encouraging cooperation. All other things being equal, the commonality among countries - whether in the form of basic values, culture, or language - enhances their attractiveness to each other. 100 In addition, convergence increases the possibility that a transformation of attitude will take place for those who participate in transnational activities. People will begin to regard foreigners in distant lands with the same concern that they have for their fellow citizens. 101 They will endeavor to help these foreigners obtain basic political rights even though the status of political rights in other countries will have no tangible beneficial impact at home. 102 Convergence does not mean that there is a single model of a market economy, a single type of democracy, or a single platform of human rights. They exist in different forms, and nations may have different combinations of these forms. 103 [\*462] A. The Perspective of One Human Race The convergence of fundamental values through globalization has profound consequences because it increases the chance that a new perspective will develop, one which views membership in the human race as the most significant societal relationship, except for nationality. 104 A person owes his or her strongest collective loyalties to the various societies with which he or she most intensely identifies. Today, this societal identification can be based on numerous factors, including nationality, race, religion, and ethnic group. 105 While it is unlikely that nationality will be surpassed as the most significant societal relationship, globalization and the convergence of values may eventually convince people in different countries that the second most important social group is the human race, and not a person's racial, religious, or ethnic group. 106 One of the first steps in the formation of a society is the recognition by prospective members that they have common interests and bonds. An essential commonality is that they share some fundamental values. A second is that they identify themselves as members belonging to the same community on the basis of a number of common ties, including shared fundamental values. A third commonality is the universality of rights - the active application of the "golden rule" - by which members expect that all must be entitled to the same rights as well as charged with the same responsibilities to ensure that these rights are protected. Globalization promotes these three types of commonalities. Globalization establishes common ground by facilitating the almost universal acceptance of market economies, the widespread emergence of democratic governments, and the extensive approval of human rights. The most visible example is economic. With the end of the Cold War, the free market economy has clearly triumphed over the command economy in the battle of the [\*463] economic paradigms. Because some variant of a market economy has taken root in virtually all countries, there has been a convergence of sorts in economic systems. 107 Further, because it often requires exposure to and pervasive interaction with foreigners - many of whom share the same fundamental values - globalization can enlarge the group that one normally identifies with. Globalization makes many of its participants empathize with the conditions and problems of people who in earlier years would have been ignored as unknown residents of remote locations. This empathy often leads to sympathy and support when these people suffer unfairly. Finally, the combination of shared values and identification produce the third commonality, universality of rights. 108 Citizens of one country will often expect, and work actively to achieve, the same basic values in other countries. They will treat nationals of other nations as they would wish to be treated. The effects of shared values, identification, and universality of rights in globalization could have a pivotal long-term effect - the possibility that a majority of human beings will begin to believe that they are truly part of a single global society - the human race. This is not to say that people disbelieve the idea that the human race encompasses all human beings. Of course, they realize that there is only one human species. Rather, the human race does not usually rank high on the hierarchy of societies for most people. Smaller societies, especially those based on nationality, race, religion, or ethnicity, command more loyalty. 109 The idea of the human race, the broadest and all-inclusive category of the human species, is abstract and has little, if any, impact on the lives of human beings. To believe in the singular importance of the human race requires an attitudinal shift in which a person views the human race seriously. [\*464] This may occur because the convergence of values does not only mean that the people of different countries will share the same basic values. It may also lead to the greater promotion of these values for the people of other countries. Historically and certainly today, America and the other industrial democracies have attempted to foster democracy and human rights in other countries. 110 While some part of this effort has been attributable to "self interest," it has also been due to the empathy that the industrialized democracies have had for other countries. 111 The magnitude of these efforts in the future, as in the past, will depend not solely upon the available financial and human resources of the industrialized democracies. It will also depend upon their national will - a factor undoubtedly influenced by the intensity with which the people of the industrialized democracies identify with people in foreign lands. The perspective that the human race matters more than its component divisions would accelerate cooperative efforts among nations to attack global problems that adversely affect human rights and the quality of human life. 112 Obviously, there is no shortage of such problems. Great suffering still occurs in so many parts of the world, not just from internal armed conflicts, 113 but also from conditions of poverty. 114 There are severe health problems in much of the world which can be mitigated with relatively little cost. 115 There are the lives lost to the AIDS epidemic, and [\*465] the deaths and disabilities caused by land mines. 116 Russia, a nuclear superpower that could end life on this planet, has severe social, economic, and political problems. 117 Making the human race important would not just promote liberal democratic values but would also reduce human suffering and perhaps eliminate completely the risk of nuclear war.

**T/Ag**

**TPP boosts ag production and trade**

**Baum 1/13**

Janell Baum graduate of the Agricultural Communications program at the University of Illinois.

“Ag industry stakeholders push passage of bill that could facilitate new trade agreements”Jan 13, 2014

http://farmfutures.com/story-tpa-legislation-receives-wide-support-0-107259

Livestock and commodity groups may not always agree on everything, but when it comes to authorizing the Trade Promotion Authority, interests representing all sides of agriculture are ready to get the ball rolling.¶ That was evident Thursday following the bipartisan, bicameral introduction of a bill that would authorize the TPA for the first time since 2007.¶ The TPA would facilitate the passage of pending trade agreements by allowing President Barack Obama to approve them without the threat of Congressional amendments. Instead, legislators would put such agreements to an up or down vote.¶ Though it limits amendments, the TPA does require that the Executive Branch seek input from Congress before, during and after negotiations. It also allows Congress to specify negotiating objectives that the Executive Branch must pursue.¶ This provision, groups say, would provide participating countries more assurance that Congress could not use several amendments to alter trade agreements, and could make agreements like the anxiously awaited Trans Pacific Partnership a reality.¶ "Both the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership **have untold potential for U.S. agricultural exports**. For these negotiations to fulfill their potential, our trade officials need the strongest possible hand when they are at the negotiating table," noted U.S. Meat Export Federation President Philip Seng in a press statement.¶ "Our trading partners need to know that once these agreements are negotiated, they are not going to be changed as they go through the approval process in Congress," Seng said.¶ Grain and commodity groups, too, supported **the measure**. National Grain and Feed Association Director of Legislative Affairs Jared Hill said his group is hopeful that the TPA will clarify negotiating priorities on sanitary and phytosanitary policies of other countries, which can be non-science based and **affect trade of agricultural goods.**

**TPP boost US ag industry**

**Shearer 1/13**

P. Scott Shearer, Bockorny Group, Washington, DC “Agricultural Groups React to Trade Promotion Authority” Jan. 13, 2014 http://nationalhogfarmer.com/business/agricultural-groups-react-trade-promotion-authority

A number of agricultural and business groups recently stated their support for the proposed Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) legislation. The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) said, “The U.S. market is one of the most open in the world, yet our farmers and ranchers face high tariffs and other noncompetitive practices when they try to export their products. For U.S. agriculture to thrive, we have to correct these disparities and level the playing field. The current Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and U.S. - European Union Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) Agreement negotiations are our best chance to expand our trade opportunities, and only with TPA can we succeed in these negotiations.”

**T/Economy**

**Massive economic growth**

Joshua **Meltzer** Brookingts Global Economy Fellow, 3/16/**12**, The Significance of the Trans-Pacific Partnership for the United States, www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2012/05/16-us-trade-strategy-meltzer

Concluding the TPP will have important economic and strategic benefits for the U.S. These benefits need to be understood in light of the TPP as a template for a future Free Trade Agreement of the Asia Pacific, where the gains to the U.S. will increase as more countries join the partnership. The Economic Benefits to the U.S. from the Trans-Pacific Partnership The Asia-Pacific region is of crucial importance for the U.S. It is the fastest growing region in the world and a key driver of global economic growth. Indeed, the region already accounts for 60 percent of global GDP and 50 percent of international trade. And the Asia-Pacific region is expected to grow by around 8 percent this year.[2] In 2011, the TPP countries had a total GDP of $17.8 trillion, of which almost 85 percent comprised the U.S. economy (see table 1 below). U.S. exports to current TPP members were worth approximately $105 billion in 2011, and imports were valued at $91 billion, meaning that the U.S. had a trade surplus with current TPP member economies of almost $14 billion (see Table 2 below). These trade flows represent approximately 5 percent of total U.S. trade. Economic modeling estimates that the benefits to the U.S. from the TPP will be $5 billion in 2015, rising to $14 billion in 2025.[3] However, the economic benefits are likely to be larger as this figure does not capture the impacts from investment liberalization under the TPP. Yet, the economic benefits for the U.S. from concluding the TPP negotiations with the current members will be limited by the market access the U.S. already has under its existing free trade agreements with Australia, Chile, Peru and Singapore. Moreover, already low U.S. tariffs on imports limits the gains to the U.S. since the main benefits from trade liberalization accrue to the country liberalizing its trade. However and as noted, the economic benefit for the U.S. of the TPP needs to be viewed in terms of it being a pathway towards a FTAAP. In this respect, Canada, Mexico and Japan have already expressed interest in joining the TPP. It is unclear at this stage whether these countries will join the current negotiations or accede to a completed TPP. In either event, the addition of Canada, Mexico and Japan would significantly increase the size of TPP GDP to $26.6 trillion, making it much more important in economic terms for the U.S. Such a TPP agreement would cover almost $650 billion of U.S. goods exports and over $800 billion of US goods imports, representing approximately 40 percent of total U.S. trade. The US also stands to grow its services trade under a TPP agreement. There is limited data on services trade with Brunei, Peru and Vietnam but for the other five TPP members U.S. services exports in 2010 were $28.9 billion and services imports were $13.5 billion, leaving the U.S. with a services trade surplus of $15.4 billion. Including Canada, Mexico and Japan in the TPP would lead to the TPP covering US services exports worth $148.3 billion and services imports of $76.4 billion. The gains to the U.S. from these countries’ participation would also double.[4] And should the TPP evolved into an FTAAP, the gains to the U.S. in 2025 would increase to around $70 billion.[5]

**TPA is key to the US economy**

**Sabas 12-10** - Research Associate at Economics21 at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research.

(Matthew, “New Opportunities from Free Trade,” http://www.economics21.org/commentary/-free-trade-TPP-TPA-EU-12-10-2014)

The United States is negotiating two trade agreements that have the potential to expand U.S. exports to a billion global consumers. The U.S.-EU Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) would liberalize trade between the United States and 39 countries across five continents, which collectively account for almost two-thirds of global economic output. ¶ The passage of both treaties would be a **boon** for the U.S. economy. The competitiveness of domestic firms would rise dramatically in partner markets, as lowered trade barriers would make the price of American merchandise drop abroad. Opening up trade would also benefit American consumers, who would gain increased choices in the marketplace. ¶ The United States began negotiations for entry into TPP in 2008 and TTIP in 2013. Both agreements have strong support from the White House and the House of Representatives. However, the Senate, under Majority Leader Harry Reid, never granted President Obama the ability to make legitimate negotiations for free trade agreements, known as Trade Promotion Authority. Mr. Reid allowed Trade Promotion Authority expire under President George W. Bush in 2007 and it was never reinstated.¶ President Obama needs Trade Promotion Authority in order to speed up the agreements. Negotiating free trade agreements presents a conundrum—Congress has authority over regulating foreign trade, while the president is responsible for negotiating treaties. Trade Promotion Authority resolves the ambiguity by allowing Congress to set the objectives and rules for the United States during negotiations. In return, Congress must hold an up-down vote on the treaty when it is finalized. ¶ This balance prevents members of Congress from slipping in special interest favors or using certain procedural tricks to prevent the agreed-upon treaty from becoming law. It also prevents a president from favoring his environmental and organized labor base in negotiations and ending up with a treaty that will be vetoed by Congress.¶ Our partners will not take trade negotiations seriously if there is a chance that one disgruntled congressman could derail a painstakingly crafted treaty that has been years in the making. The UK’s House of Lords has noted as much in a recent report, stating, “[w]ithout Trade Promotion Authority, the United States cannot make serious offers as part of the TTIP negotiations.”¶ With Senator Mitch McConnell as Majority Leader, trade agreements will have another chance in America. However, there is still the possibility that rising protectionism abroad, particularly in economically-anemic Europe and Japan, could make it politically impossible to complete work on the negotiations. This underscores the need for Congress to act swiftly when it convenes in January. ¶ The figure below shows that the United States has substantial exports to countries in the trade negotiations. TPP countries import 44 percent of total U.S. exports, and the EU accounts for another 17 percent. By reducing anti-free trade practices in other countries, U.S. exports to these countries will increase at a much faster rate, but the more technical aspects of the treaty-regulations could be the most valuable for cutting export costs.¶ If TTIP is passed, U.S. exports to the European Union are predicted to grow by 37 percent. The increase in U.S. exports would total $300 billion, increasing GDP by $125 billion annually and adding 13 million jobs to the economies by 2027.¶ Approving TPP would lower trade barriers to an alternative set of economies—Japan, Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam. Though the countries differ, the economic benefits do not. TPP would increase U.S. national income by an estimated $77 billion per year, potentially leading to an additional $123.5 billion in U.S. exports by 2025. ¶ There is no question that **a massive influx of** income would result from the passage of both agreements. The increase to America’s export sector alone would be larger than the entire economy of Denmark. The U.S. economy would benefit from an additional $200 billion in income, in addition to consumers’ access to superior goods at lower cost. ¶ The signatories’ large economies and high share of international trade ensure that the proposed agreements will be felt globally. The European Union, United States, and TPP economies account for 61 percent of the world’s GDP, and import 43 percent of all goods exported in 2013. ¶ The development of high-standard, comprehensive trade agreements under the direction of the U.S. would create the template for global trade and regulatory policy. To remain competitive in the world’s largest consumer markets, export-dependent countries such as China would have to adapt to the standards agreed upon by the European Union and United States, and among the TPP countries. ¶ China is attempting to influence the outcome of the trade agreements’ by promoting an alternative plan with different set of standards, termed the Free-Trade Area of the Asia Pacific (FTTAP). This trade agreement would include the 12 TPP countries, as well as China, Russia, and 7 other countries located in the Pacific region, as illustrated below: ¶ Commerce and capitalism can only thrive in a fair market, and that is why the United States should pursue both agreements, adequately safeguarding American interests and avoiding the advice of centrally planned or otherwise corrupt states. The TPP agreement has left the option for additional members in the Asia-Pacific region to join. America would benefit from signing a high-standard TPP and then bringing China into the fold, rather than giving China the opportunity to present a trade agreement that primarily fits China’s agenda. ¶ **Free trade should be Congress’s first order of business**. Otherwise, it will have squandered an opportunity to expand employment and set global standards for international trade.

**Overwhelming economic consensus**

**Lincicome 14** - international trade attorney, senior visiting lecturer at Duke University Law School

(Scott, November, “Don’t Drink The Obamatrade Snake Oil,” http://thefederalist.com/2014/11/10/dont-drink-the-obamatrade-snake-oil/)

The Case for Trade, FTAs, and TPA

The case for free trade is simple and decisive. Not only is there **overwhelming economic consensus** as to the benefits of open markets for American consumers, workers, and companies, but the antithesis of free trade—protectionism—is clearly an immoral use of government force to thwart voluntary private transactions, raise domestic prices, and thereby line the pockets of a few, well-connected cronies. Protectionism raises costs, lowers living standards, and redistributes money from American families and businesses (more than half of all imports are industrial inputs and machinery) to a handful of firms that have successfully lobbied the government to inhibit foreign competition through forcible, non-market means.¶ Self-interested politicians frequently grant special anti-trade favors, although fully aware that protectionist votes hurt the vast majority of the American public, especially its most vulnerable.¶ The politics of trade, however, are not nearly so simple. Specific subsidies and trade barriers concentrate benefits on workers and firms that hire lobbyists and influence politicians to erect or maintain such policies. At the same time, this protectionism’s diffuse costs to American consumers are typically insufficient to motivate them to lobby against the cronyism. As a result, self-interested politicians—many of whom have opportunistic factories or farms in their districts—frequently grant the hard-lobbying groups special anti-trade favors, fully aware that free trade is the best economic policy for the country as a whole, and that protectionist votes hurt the vast majority of the American public, especially its most vulnerable. One needs look no further than the costly, immoral U.S. sugar program to see these principles in all-too-depressing action.¶ Although unilaterally eliminating import and export barriers is the most direct and obvious way to maximize the moral and economic gains from trade, the reason we’ve seen substantial liberalization of trade over the last half century is because the United States has engaged in “reciprocal” agreements like NAFTA and the GATT that lower trade barriers at home and abroad. The value of reciprocal agreements is primarily political: by tying open domestic markets to open foreign markets, reciprocal agreements counterbalance opposition from import-competing businesses with support from exporters who both benefit from new market access and face potential retaliation from trading partners for any protectionist backsliding by the U.S. government.¶ While imperfect, reciprocal trade deals still generate significant, positive economic results and enhance consumer freedom. As a result, there is quite literally no mainstream policy on which economists—left, right, and center—agree more than U.S. FTAs.¶ Although trade agreements provide a mechanism for overcoming political opposition to free trade, they also create new political problems of their own, most of which stem from the inherent conflict in the U.S. Constitution between the power granted to Congress to “regulate commerce with foreign nations” (Article I, Section 8) and that granted to the president to negotiate treaties (Article II, Section 2) and otherwise act as the “face” of U.S. international relations. In short, the executive branch is authorized to negotiate trade agreements that escape much of the legislative sausage-making that goes in Washington, but, consistent with the Constitution, any such deals still require congressional approval—a process that could alter the agreement’s terms via congressional amendments intended to appease influential constituents. The possibility that, after years of negotiations, an unfettered Congress could add last-minute demands to an FTA (or eliminate its biggest benefits) discourages all but the most eager U.S. trading partners to sign on to any such deal.¶ Fast Track Preserves Congressional Authority¶ TPA, also known as “fast track,” was designed to fix this problem. TPA is an arrangement between the U.S. executive and legislative branches, under which Congress agrees to hold a timely, up-or-down vote (i.e., no amendments) on future trade agreements in exchange for the president agreeing to follow certain negotiating objectives set by Congress and to consult with the legislative branch before, during, and after FTA negotiations. In essence, Congress agrees to streamline the approval process as long as the president negotiates agreements that it likes.¶ If the president ignores their demands, Congress can reject the final FTA’s implementing legislation, and there’s nothing the president can do about it.¶ By moving Congress’s input to an earlier, less disruptive stage, TPA is a win-win for Congress and the president. It prevents members of Congress from changing an already-completed agreement or from holding it hostage in committee, and it gives members multiple chances to advance their pet issues through consultations and negotiating objectives. Indeed, the most recently proposed TPA bill includes more than 70 pages of congressional objectives, all of which limit the president’s room to negotiate (for better or worse). If the president ignores these demands, Congress can reject the final FTA’s implementing legislation, and there’s nothing the president can do about it.

**T/Environment**

**TPP solves environment---better than alternatives forums**

**Meltzer 14** - Fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution and adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies

International trade rules also reflect decisions that governments take about how to balance the growth-promoting aspects of international trade with the need for resource conservation. And as new environmental challenges have arisen, particularly climate change, new bargains need to be struck about how trade rules should be used to support efforts to address this challenge.¶ As a twenty-first-century trade agreement, the TPP is currently the **best** opportunity to address current environmental challenges. The TPP is also the first major plurilateral trade negotiation post the WTO Doha Round where both the impacts of climate change and the inability to make significant progress in the United Nations climate change negotiations are¶ clear. This highlights the importance of using the TPP to develop new international trade rules that can enable countries to develop their economies in an environmentally sustainable manner.¶ Whether it is depleting fisheries, declining biodiversity or reduced space in the atmosphere for GHG emissions, the underlying issue is resource scarcity. And in a world where an additional 3 billion people are expected to enter the middle class over the next 15 years, countries need to find new and creative ways to cooperate in order to satisfy the legitimate needs of their population for growth and opportunity while using resources in a manner that is sustainable for current and future generations.101 The TPP parties already represent a diverse range of developed and developing countries. Should the TPP become a free trade agreement of the Asia-Pacific region, it will include the main developed and developing countries and will be a **strong basis** for building a global consensus on these trade and environmental issues.

**T/India Relations**

**TPP revitalizes Asia pacific region – key to Indian economic recovery which is fundamental to strong relations – TPP negotiations with India demonstrate commitment to mutliateral trade – that solves their internal**

Aziz Haniffa in Washington DC Rediff Reporter, Citing American Enterprise Institute Resident Fellows Sadanand **Dhume and** Aparna **Mathur**, and Research Associate, Hemal Shah.

Report cited: Titled, ‘Falling Short: How Bad Economic Choices Threaten the US-India Relationship and India’s Rise’ 12-25-**2013**

http://www.rediff.com/business/slide-show/slide-show-1-us-india-a-relationship-threatened-by-bad-economic-choices/20131225.htm#7

Few years back, US was supporting India to become an economic superpower. But things went wrong between the two since India started witnessing economic slowdown. Second generation Indian-American policy wonks assess where both countries are falling short.¶ A report co-authored by second generation Indian Americans - rising stars in the policy wonk world of Washington, DC - has taken a pessimistic view of the United States-India relationship, owing to the problems with economic and trade ties between the countries.¶ Titled, ‘Falling Short: How Bad Economic Choices Threaten the US-India Relationship and India’s Rise’, the report is co-authored by American Enterprise Institute Resident Fellows Sadanand Dhume and Aparna Mathur, and Research Associate, Hemal Shah.¶ Dhume, the report’s lead author, tells India Abroad, “The timing of the report is somewhat fortuitous. We embarked upon this research two years ago, when the US-India economic relationship looked robust, but during the course of our writing India’s economy slowed drastically and several business differences arose between the two countries.”¶ He adds, “Both Democrats and Republicans back India’s rise, but a strategic partnership built on weak foundations will likely flounder.”¶ According to the report, US–India relations stand at a crossroads. Not so long ago, many in Washington viewed the signing of the historic US-India civil nuclear deal as the advent of a dynamic partnership with the potential to transform Asia and the world. Today US-India ties are just as often characterised as unrealistic or oversold.¶ The report acknowledges that successive American and Indian administrations have ‘chipped away at the mistrust that once characterised’ the relationship.¶ They talk to each other more often, about more things - engaged in more than 30 dialogues discussing everything from Afghanistan and counter-terrorism to vocational education and clean cookstoves - and at higher levels than ever before.¶ Republicans and Democrats alike generally agree that the goal of a strong India - as a symbol of democratic capitalism, an implicit counterweight to Chinese hegemony, an ally in the long war against radical Islam, and an engine of global growth - remains worth supporting, the report notes.¶ The United States also views stronger ties with India as an essential part of its ‘rebalance’ toward Asia.¶ But, for all this talk and public declarations, ‘a strategic partnership built on weak foundations will likely flounder… Economic and trade ties, which ought to be the lifeblood of a US-India partnership, have traditionally played second fiddle to strategic considerations and remain far below potential’, according to the report.¶ Even as the United States remains India’s top trade partner - in goods and services - and US-India trade continues to grow, the importance of the United States to India’s economy may be declining.¶ Since 2004, the share of the United States in India’s total trade has fallen, as has the US share of foreign direct investment inflows to India… Simply put, neither country treats the other as a trade priority in Asia, states the report.¶ The report cites how many firms route their investments to India through the tax haven of Mauritius due to the lack of progress on a bilateral investment treaty as well as the disputes regarding potential US restrictions on services trade and Indian policies on intellectual property rights, preferential market access, and taxation have roiled the relationship.¶ It does not help that over the past 18 months, India’s economic growth has plunged to 4 per cent per year, the lowest level in a decade. Dhume tells India Abroad, “Slowing growth raises questions about whether India will live up to some of the forecasts that have underpinned its rise to strategic prominence in Washington.”¶ These forecasts include the National Intelligence Council’s estimate that by 2030 India will be the largest driver of middle-class growth and surpass China in economic dynamism. And also the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development’s prediction that by 2060 India will account for 18 per cent of global economic output.¶ Both predictions ‘hinge on sustained high growth’ the authors point out.¶ Shah tells India Abroad, “Though the logic of a closer US-India relationship may seem self-evident, and progress toward it inexorable, reality does not always match rhetoric. Simply put, the two countries are yet to establish economic ties worthy of their combined gross domestic product of over $20 trillion in PPP terms.”¶ She adds, “The key to fulfilling the strategic potential of the US-India relationship is to foster a vibrant, entrepreneurial Indian economy linked to America by ideas, capital, people, and technology.”¶ For the US, the report notes, “this means remaining true to its own principles of economic freedom when it comes to issues such as services trade, liquefied natural gas exports, and the expansion of multilateral trading regimes. Washington should also recognise the shifting shape of India’s polity by stepping up engagement with India’s best-performing state governments.”¶ For India, it says, this means, “the firm repudiation of anti-market measures that have soured both foreign and domestic investors and a renewed commitment to the incomplete task of economic reform, prioritising the negotiation of a high-quality bilateral investment treaty, improving protection for intellectual property rights, and improving conditions for manufacturing and taxation policy.¶ Mathur tells India Abroad, “India’s growth story has been and will always be about India’s entrepreneurs.”¶ Denying them an environment to do business will be detrimental to India’s rise since it has been the private sector and the entrepreneurs who have been the catalyst behind India’s prominence globally.¶ “All they want is a reasonable business environment with minimal corruption and red tape, and they will thrive. It’s time we listened to them,” says Mathur.¶ The report urges both Washington and New Delhi ‘to prevent temporary hiccups from derailing what ought to be a deep economic and strategic convergence.’¶ Although ultimately the United States and India should aim for a free trade agreement and Indian membership in the Trans-Pacific Partnership, for now the more modest goals of a high-quality bilateral investment treaty and Indian membership in Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation are more achievable, says the report.¶ The authors also warn, “Time is not on India’s side. After nearly a decade of stuttering reforms, both foreign and domestic investors are looking at India with greater scepticism than at any time since the onset of liberalisation in 1991… Whoever is elected to run India after next year’s general elections will have their work cut out for them. The country, which already lags most of East Asia in terms of both income and human development, can scarcely afford to slip behind further. If growth continues to stall, it will jeopardise both the US–India strategic partnership and India’s rise as a global power.”

**T/Manufacturing**

**Key to manufacturing**

Joshua **Meltzer** Brookingts Global Economy Fellow, 3/16/**12**, The Significance of the Trans-Pacific Partnership for the United States, www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2012/05/16-us-trade-strategy-meltzer

The TPP should lead to increased opportunities for growth for American small business exporters. As a starting point, the TPP will increase U.S. GDP and exports, and these benefits will increase as more countries join. In fact, under a FTAAP, U.S. exports of manufactured goods are expected to increase by almost $120 billion and services exports are expected to increase by almost $200 billion.[6]¶ The TPP’s impact on American small businesses and the U.S. manufacturing sector can also be inferred by looking at the impact of other free trade agreements. For example, under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)[7] and the U.S.- Central American-Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR),[8] the U.S. has a trade surplus in manufactured goods of $12 billion and $3 billion, respectively.[9] In addition, U.S. exports of manufactured goods to NAFTA and CAFTA-DR countries are growing faster than imports.¶ These figures demonstrate that the U.S. manufacturing sector is world class and highly competitive, and in many sectors the U.S. already operates behind low tariff barriers. Moreover, competition from abroad has also driven U.S. productivity gains and has enabled American manufacturers to source inputs from the lowest cost providers, further enhancing overall competitiveness. Further trade liberalization under the TPP is therefore likely to provide additional opportunities for the U.S. manufacturing sector overseas.¶ U.S. small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) also stand to gain from trade liberalization. In fact, almost 98 percent of all exporters and 97 percent of all importers are SMEs, representing almost 40 percent of U.S. goods exports and 31.5 percent of goods imports.[10] In addition, 94 percent of SMEs are exporters and importers. Therefore, trade agreements that liberalize trade barriers, like the TPP, should disproportionately benefit SMEs. In contrast with large businesses, SMEs generally benefit the most from government efforts to reduce trade barriers overseas as their capacity to overcome these barriers by establishing subsidiaries in other countries is much more limited.

**T/Overfishing and Oceans**

**Trade policy solves overfishing and ocean conservation**

**Africa News 2014**

“United States, Canada and Africa; U.S. Trade Policy Supports Obama's Actions to Protect Oceans” June 18, 2014 CSSH Lexis Nexis Scholastic

U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman says that keeping our oceans healthy requires us to use every tool we have available, and trade policy is a powerful tool. U.S. Trade Representative (USTR) Michael Froman welcomed President Obama's executive actions to combat illegal fishing and support trade in legal, sustainable seafood in a June 17 statement. "Keeping our oceans healthy requires us to use every tool we have available," Froman said, "and trade policy is a powerful tool. Strong, enforceable environmental provisions are central objectives for the administration in our ongoing trade negotiations, and we're making good progress." The Obama administration is negotiating "two of the most ambitious trade agreements in history": the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP) Agreement with the European Union and the TPP, with 11 other Asia-Pacific countries. "Together these agreements will cover a significant amount of the world's seafood trade and present an opportunity to advance groundbreaking oceans and marine conservation commitments," the Commerce Department said. The United States is pursuing these TPP commitments: - Advance sustainable fisheries management, including management systems based on internationally recognized best practices and the best scientific information available. - Combat illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing. - Prohibit some of the most harmful fisheries subsidies, such as those that contribute to overfishing. - Promote the long-term conservation of sharks and other threatened marine species.

**T/Warming**

**TPP solves warming---lowers tariffs on environmental goods and incentivizes more stringent regulations**

**Meltzer 14** - Fellow in Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution and adjunct professor at the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies

Reduced tariffs on environmental goods can support domestic efforts towards environmental conservation and reducing GHG emissions. In particular, for TPP developing economies whose average bound tariffs are higher than developed economies, the environmental gains from reducing tariffs on environmental goods are potentially significant.57 As developed country tariffs on environmental goods are already low, reducing these tariffs further is unlikely to provide much incentive for business in these countries to increase their levels of environmental conservation.58 At the 2011 APEC meeting in Honolulu, the TPP parties released an outline of the key goals for the TPP, which include eliminating tariffs and other barriers to trade in goods and services.59 Reducing tariffs on all goods to zero would overcome the need to develop a separate list of environmental goods. However, in the event that the TPP parties do not reach this goal or agree instead to phase out tariffs on goods, then ensuring trade barriers are eliminated on an appropriate list of environmental goods should remain a priority. Reducing tariffs on environmental goods has been an ongoing element of the WTO Doha negotiations, though progress has been frustrated by the challenge of agreeing a list of environmental goods. At the APEC Summit in Vladivostok in 2012, the APEC economies agreed on a list of 54 environmental goods on which they would cut tariffs to 5 per cent or less by the end of 2015.60 Agreeing on this list of environmental goods is a good start but it is a limited list compared with lists of environmental goods developed by APEC and the World Bank; it could be expanded upon in the TPP.61 There are, moreover, limits to developing lists that largely define an environmental good based on its end-use.62 This is particularly the case in the climate change context, where the way in which goods are produced and disposed of largely determines their GHG emissions lifecycle. For instance, in the US, the electricity sector produces 40 per cent of GHG emissions and the commercial and industrial sectors produce approximately 20 per cent.63 This has led countries to regulate goods’ GHG lifecycle.64 For instance, the US Renewable Fuel Standard, which requires fuel sold and imported into the US to have a specific quantity of renewable fuel, identifies four categories of renewable fuels based on their GHG lifecycle. European Union (EU) countries, such as Germany and the United Kingdom, have also adopted laws that regulate renewable energy and transportation fuels based on their GHG emissions lifecycle.65 The TPP parties should therefore consider defining environmental goods by their lifecycle or production process. Providing a tariff cut for such goods would create the strongest incentive for industry to use less carbon-intensive production processes and thereby contribute the most to reducing GHG emissions.66 It is also the case that more stringent environmental regulation will be required in order for reduced trade barriers on environmental goods to lead to better environmental outcomes.67 This is because, in a perfectly competitive market, firms do not have an incentive to go beyond what the law requires them to do. However, to the extent that lower tariffs reduce the cost of complying with environmental or climate change laws, this could create political space for the adoption of even more stringent regulations.68 Reducing the costs of green technologies should also provide opportunities for business to demonstrate corporate social responsibility by doing more to reduce their GHG emissions.

**Trade solves warming**

**Griswold 2001**

Daniel. Director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies, Masters in economics from London School of Economics. 8/2/1. http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-015b.pdf

Expanding trade is not merely compatible with high standards of environmental quality but can lead directly to their improvement. As a country sees its standard of living rise through economic liberalization and trade expansion, its industry can more readily afford to control emissions. Its citizens have more to spend, above what they need for subsistence, on the “luxury good” of improved environmental quality. And as economic growth creates an expanding, bet- ter-educated middle class, the political demand rises for pollution abatement. That explains why the most stringent environmental laws in the world today are found in developed countries that are relatively open to trade.¶ Development by itself can have a mixed impact on the environment. All else being equal, an economy that produces more of exactly the same goods and services in exactly the same way will produce more pollution. But development changes not only the size of an economy but also its composition and its level of technology. More sophisticated technology can mean cleaner pro- duction processes and more affordable and effective pollution abatement. And as nations progress to higher stages of development, they tend to move away from more resource-inten- sive activities such as mining, agriculture, and heavy industry and into light manufacturing, information technology, and services. A study by the OECD on globalization and the environment found: “There is some evidence that, once a country begins to industrialize, trade liberalization helps to make the structure of its econo- my less pollution-intensive than in those countries whose economies remain relatively closed. In particular, freer trade seems to promote the transition from heavy resource-processing sectors to light manufacturing ones (at least at mid- dle income levels).”29

# Affirmative

### No PC – Clear the Deck Thumper

#### Obama’s clearing the deck for next president – Gitmo, trade, and fopo will cost PC

Kounalakis 6/5

Markos Kounalakis is a research fellow at Central European University and visiting fellow at the Hoover Institution. JUNE 5, 2016 “In foreign affairs, Obama clears the decks, sets the stage for next president” http://www.sacbee.com/opinion/op-ed/article81657357.html

President Barack Obama is spending his political capital, one country at a time. Going around the world to bridge relations with former adversaries, recognize and right historical wrongs, or write new chapters in an evolving world order is seldom a president’s first-term work. It is the politically difficult work done at the end of a leader’s last term, a time when he is free of re-election concerns. In the last few weeks, the president traveled to Japan and Vietnam, executing on his rebalance to Asia, a strategy that will be inherited by future presidents. But he was able to do more. In Hiroshima, where the atom bomb leveled a city and killed its inhabitants, Obama helped heal one more open wound of America’s past – one where there needed to be an official American recognition and reckoning, not an apology. Hiroshima is a stark reminder to this and future presidents to work toward a world free of nuclear weapons. Ronald Reagan deeply articulated this vision, Obama is the latest president to give this goal voice. Obama’s “fourth quarter” in the Oval Office reflects how other presidents used their lame-duck session to reconcile overseas actions and leverage the unique power of the presidency in foreign affairs. Bill Clinton used his term’s end to apologize to Greece for the Junta’s U.S. support, pursue a wholehearted Middle East peace process at Camp David (Arafat balked and undermined it), launched a series of attacks on Osama bin Laden’s Afghan training bases, and brought an enlarged NATO together for a bombing campaign to stop ethnic cleansing in Kosovo. George H.W. Bush signed the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with the Soviet Union’s Mikhail Gorbachev, managed the end of the Cold War, initiated the Gulf War “Desert Storm,” and went to war in Somalia before heading out the door to Kennebunkport. Bush intended to lay the difficult groundwork for a “new world order” for his successors. Presidents leave their successors with unfinished business and messes to mop up, but they also find time and energy to clean up some of the politically difficult tasks. IT CAN BE AN OUTGOING PRESIDENT’S GIFT TO HIS SUCCESSOR – REGARDLESS OF PARTY – TO DEAL WITH INTRACTABLE OR POLITICALLY CHALLENGING PROBLEMS. Taking care of tough foreign business frees a new, first-term president from needing immediately to deal with foreign entanglements. New presidents are usually elected to focus on domestic economics, a 100-day political agenda, the fulfillment of campaign promises and the reality of running an all-too-soon re-election for a second-term. The world and its problems, however, have a way of interjecting themselves. Given all this, it can be an outgoing president’s gift to his successor – regardless of party – to deal with intractable or politically challenging problems. Obama is actively clearing the decks for the 45th president of the United States: ▪ Cuba: Finally, the conditions were right and the Florida constituencies prepared for action to normalize relations with Havana. Obama ended a 50-year policy that he said “failed to advance our interests.” ▪ Iran: Secretive two-track diplomacy that started in the Reagan administration came out into the open and resulted in an imperfect, but desirable, freeze on Iran’s nuclear capacities. President George W. Bush began a forceful sanctions regime and Obama combined it with tireless diplomacy to open a channel for communication and narrow cooperation. ▪ Japan: America’s World War II atom bombs and current military presence were always the elephant in the room in U.S.-Japan relations. Obama has started a new chapter and open dialogue with this key Asian ally. The Hiroshima gesture and speech give the next president an even stronger platform to fight for nuclear nonproliferation – despite the dangerous musings of one presidential candidate to open the door to Tokyo, Seoul and Riyadh to acquire nuclear arsenals. Regardless, the next commander in chief inherits ongoing challenges in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Egypt … actually, the whole Middle East. Early geopolitical surprises, courtesy of China and Russia, are a near certainty come January 2017. But as Obama reviews his checklist, Guantánamo prison and global trade deals remain high up as the fourth quarter clock ticks down.

### Won’t Pass – No Votes

#### Obama doesn’t have the votes for ratification

Kit 6/20

Tang See Kit, Assistant Producer at CNBC.com's Asia-Pacific team. She writes the daily market report on Asian stocks, alongside feature articles with a focus on Asian economies. Channel NewsAsia “Hurdles to US ratification leave fate of TPP deal hanging” 20 Jun 2016

http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/business/hurdles-to-us/2886288.html

SINGAPORE: During his visit to Vietnam last month, US President Barack Obama reiterated his confidence that the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) free trade agreement will be able to earn the approval of the US Congress by the end of this year. But with anti-trade sentiment bubbling as the US election season gets underway, the reality paints a less optimistic picture. The TPP – one of the world's biggest multi-national trade deals and the economic centrepiece of Mr Obama's "pivot to Asia" – was signed by leaders from its 12 member nations back in February, following five long years of negotiations. Covering 40 per cent of the world economy, the agreement will expand markets, lower or erase tariffs and duties, as well as set common standards on issues ranging from workers' rights to intellectual property protection in 12 Pacific nations. For the far-reaching trade pact to go into effect, however, requires ratification from at least six countries that account for 85 per cent of the combined gross domestic production (GDP) across the TPP nations. Thus far, this has made little progress, with ratification for the accord facing political hurdles in member nations such as Canada and Japan. In particular, the TPP, amid concerns that it could threaten American jobs, has become a hot-button issue at the upcoming US presidential election, with major-party candidates coming out against it. Presumptive Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has made a U-turn to oppose the agreement she once described as "setting the gold standard" in 2012, while her Republican counterpart Donald Trump called the TPP "a disaster" and warned that it could encourage US firms to relocate productions abroad. This tide of rising opposition within Mr Obama's own party and from a handful of Republicans indicates there is "a very small chance" of a TPP ratification this year, said Assistant Professor Kaewkamol Pitakdumrongkit from the Centre for Multilateralism Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore. "TPP, like all other trade deals, creates winners and losers. Multinational companies or some farmers may gain access to new markets overseas but there are those who lose out, namely workers in labour-intensive industries," Ms Pitakdumrongkit said. With the Democrats being dependent on labour unions for votes, standing alongside the TPP and risk angering the unions would be a no-no in times of election. On the other hand, some pro-business Republicans are unhappy with certain details in the TPP such as the period of market exclusivity for biologic drugs, which they argue is a weak provision that could have a negative impact on the industry. "Given that the election race is heating up. parties would avoid voting on controversial legislation like the TPP, as doing so is seen as too risky. That's why I don't think Obama can muster enough votes to ratify the TPP this year," Ms Pitakdumrongkit added. [Assistant Professor from the Centre for Multilateralism Studies at the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies in Singapore.]

### Won’t Pass – Opposition Momentum

#### No vote until post-election – opposition has the momentum

Brodey 6/20

Sam Brodey is MinnPost's Washington correspondent. “If the trans-Pacific trade deal is going to happen, it’s going to happen after the election” 06/20/16

https://www.minnpost.com/politics-policy/2016/06/if-trans-pacific-trade-deal-going-happen-it-s-going-happen-after-election

Ellison, Nolan, plan to attack hard That’s what Rep. Keith Ellison is vowing to do. He feels confident that he, and his progressive allies, can shut TPP down — and potentially deny their president a legacy-making achievement. Ellison told MinnPost that the momentum is on their side after an impressive stand against the White House last year. “Things have gotten worse for TPP,” he said, saying that the release of the text confirmed his and others’ suspicions of how bad agreement would be. He acknowledged that if TPP comes up, it will likely be after the elections. “They’ve got one tight window to get it through,” he said. “From an organizational standpoint, what we’re saying is, get ready, because they’re coming right after the election. It allows us to identify the time period that we have to play very good defense.” Eighth District Rep. Rick Nolan has also emerged as a vocal opponent of TPP — he argues it will put the mining and metals industry in his district at a further competitive disadvantage to international competition. “Our message to everybody,” Nolan said, “is that there should not be a vote on it in the lame duck. Let the new Congress deal with it if this Congress refuses to.” He said that the group that opposes TPP has been successful in converting members who might be on the fence. “We’ve been gaining resonance slowly but surely, bipartisanly, and then with Bernie and Hillary and Trump all against this thing, more people have become more aware about just how disastrous these trade agreements are.”

#### TPP won’t pass - defeat is inevitable due to upcoming election

**Global Trade 6/24** (Global Trade, “U.S trade: Prospects Dimming for TPP”, Global Trade, http://www.globaltrademag.com/global-trade-daily/commentary/u-s-trade-prospects-dimming-for-tpp)//SB

When there were more than 20 people running for president of the United States, the future of the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade agreement seemed uncertain.∂ Now that just three candidates remain its defeat is all but certain, unless TPP’s most ardent advocate, who still occupies the Oval Office for another six months, can find a way to move it forward.∂ Thus far, however, President Obama’s desire to adopt TPP has been thwarted in Congress. The administration may now be pinning its hopes on ratification during the “lame duck” session between the November election and the swearing in of a new President in January.∂ But as the election approaches it is clear that the candidates from the two political parties don’t agree on much of anything ­– except their opposition to this one particular agreement.

### Won’t Pass – Not Even Lame Duck

#### Lame duck passage odds at zero

O’Meara 6/20

Patrick O'Meara, Economics Correspondent, “Will US approve TPP in lame-duck period?” 20 June 2016

http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/political/306796/will-us-approve-tpp-in-lame-duck-period

But another TPP opponent, Auckland law professor Jane Kelsey places the odds of a lame-duck vote as next to zero. Professor Kelsey argues Republicans have continued to play hardball in demanding the monopoly protection period for next generation drugs called biologics will be beefed up from 5 to 12 years. "The gatekeeper to that, (Republican Senate Finance Committee chairman) Orrin Hatch, has just upped the ante on it. So, unless he's satisfied, he has said he won't allow it into the Congress for a vote during the so-called lame-duck period," Professor Kelsey said.

### Lame Duck PC Not Key

#### TPP vote is lame duck

Behsudi 6/21

Adam Behsudi is a trade reporter for POLITICO Pro. “China BIT still alive, for now” <http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-trade/2016/06/china-bit-still-alive-for-now-214929>

FROMAN: TPP PREP IS HAPPENING: The Obama administration is in the process of drafting all the documents required for getting the TPP through Congress under fast-track procedures in Trade Promotion Authority legislation, U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman said Monday.

“Under TPA there are a number of products that are called for: the statement of administration action, the implementing bill, there are a series of reports and we’re working on all of those,” Froman told reporters after a meeting in New York. “We’re also consulting with Congress on what the appropriate timing is for moving forward and with regard to the outstanding issues.” The White House has a narrowing window of time to get the TPP through Congress before President Barack Obama leaves office. Congressional leadership has all but ruled out a vote before the November elections, leaving a potential lame-duck session as the only time for consideration of the deal. As of now, the White House still hasn't sent Congress a draft statement of administrative action detailing how it plans to implement the trade pact. Under fast track, the White House must submit the draft action plan, along with the final legal text of the agreement, at least 30 days before sending Congress the implementing bill.

#### That doesn’t require PC

O’Meara 6/20

Patrick O'Meara, Economics Correspondent, “Will US approve TPP in lame-duck period?” 20 June 2016

http://www.radionz.co.nz/news/political/306796/will-us-approve-tpp-in-lame-duck-period

Dr Elms and other TPP supporters are banking on Congress backing the TPP in the period between elections in November and mid-January - the so-called lame duck period. "The lame-duck session is one where all rules don't apply. Lots of unpopular things get done in the lame-duck period, and I think in this particular lame-duck period TPP is the first thing on the agenda of unpopular things that will get done." A visiting trade expert and TPP opponent Jomo Kwame Sundaram states it more baldly. Dr Jomo said the lame-duck period allowed the Republicans to deny President Barack Obama any political credit from TPP, and enhanced the chances of outgoing politicians to find work. "That's the time politicians who have lost in the Senate or Congressional races have to think about their post-retirement plans. And that concern alone tends to fixate the mind, " Dr Jomo said.

## Aff PC Not Real

### Dickerson

#### Action on controversial issues splits the GOP – key to the agenda

Dickerson 13

John, Slate’s chief political correspondent, Go for the Throat!, 1/18/13, http://www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon.¶ Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day.¶ But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country.¶ The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat.¶ President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker.¶ How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. ¶ That's the old way. He has abandoned that. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. ¶ Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

### Winners Win

#### Winner’s win

Singer 9 - senior writer and editor for MyDD. Singer is perhaps best known for his various interviews with prominent politicians. His interviews have included John Kerry, Walter Mondale, Bob Dole, Michael Dukakis, and George McGovern, Barack Obama, John Edwards, and Tom Vilsack. He has also also interviewed dozens of senatorial, congressional and gubernatorial candidates all around the country. In his writing, Singer primarily covers all aspects of campaigns and elections, from polling and fundraising to opposition research and insider rumors

Jonathan, *He has been quoted or cited in this capacity* by Newsweek, The New York Times, USA Today, The Politico, and others. My Direct Democracy, 3-3-09, <http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428>)

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey: Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note**,** too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital.Indeed**,** that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### Empirically true- reciprocal relationship between PC spent and later achievement

Green 10 [David Michael, Professor of political science at Hofstra University, The Do-Nothing 44th President, June 12th, http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html]

The **fundamental characteristic** of the Obama presidency is that the president is a reactive object, essentially the victim of events and other political forces, rather than the single greatest center of power in the country, and arguably on the planet. He is the Mr. Bill of politicians. People sometimes excuse the Obama torpor by making reference to all the problems on his plate, and all the enemies at his gate. But what they fail to understand - and, most crucially, what he fails to understand - is the nature of the modern presidency. Successful presidents today (by which I mean those who get what they want) not only drive outcomes in their preferred direction, but shape the very character of the debate itself. And they not only shape the character of the debate, but they determine which items are on the docket. Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and **reciprocal relationship** between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that **nothing** breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a **steamroller effect** and feigning a **clubby atmosphere** for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By **jumping on board** the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the **winning team**. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did. But the game of successfully governing is substantive as well as psychological. More often than not, timidity turns out not to yield the safe course anticipated by those with weak knees, but rather their **subsequent undoing**. The three cases mentioned at the top of this essay are paradigmatic.

### PC Not Real

#### Political capital’s not real – other factors outweigh

**Dickinson, 9** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (Matthew, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, 5/26/09, http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

#### PC not real- it’s a myth- vote based on ideology

Frank Moraes is a freelance writer with broad interests. He is educated as a scientist with a PhD in Atmospheric Physics. He has worked in climate science, remote sensing, and throughout the computer industry. And he has taught physics. 1-8-2013 <http://the-reaction.blogspot.com/2013/01/political-capital-is-myth.html>

Yesterday, Jonathan Chait metaphorically scratched his head: "Nominating Hagel Most Un-Obama Thing Ever." He can't understand this nomination given that (1) Hagel will be a hard sell and (2) Obama doesn't much listen to his advisers anyway. It is interesting speculation, but I wouldn't have even thought about it had he not written, "Why waste political capital picking a fight that isn't essential to any policy goals?"¶ This brought to mind something that has been on my mind for a while, as in posts like "Bipartisan Consensus Can Bite Me." I'm afraid that just like Santa Claus and most conceptions of God, "Political Capital" is a myth. I think it is just an idea that Villagers find comforting. It is a neat narrative in which one can straightjacket a political fight. Otherwise, it is just bullshit.¶ Let's go back to late 2004, after Bush Jr was re-elected. He said, "I earned capital in the political campaign and I intend to spend it." What was this thing that Bush intended to spend? It is usually said that political capital is some kind of mandate from the masses. But that is clearly not what Bush meant. He got a mandate to fuck the poor and kill the gays. But he used his political capital to privatize Social Security. One could say that this proves the point, but does anyone really think if Bush had decided to use his political capital destroying food stamps and Medicaid that he would have succeeded any better? The truth was that Bush's political capital didn't exist.¶ Let's look at more recent events: the Fiscal Cliff. Obama didn't win that fight because the people who voted for him demanded it. He won it because everyone knew that in the new year he would still be president. Tax rates were going up. Boehner took the Fiscal Cliff deal because it was the best deal that he felt he could get. He didn't fold because of some magic political capital that Obama could wave over him.¶ There is no doubt that public opinion does affect how politicians act. Even politicians in small safe districts have to worry that larger political trends may end up making them look stupid, out of touch, or just cruel. But beyond that, they really don't care. If they did, then everyone in the House would now be a Democrat: after all, Obama won a mandate and the associated political capital. But they don't, because presidential elections have consequences -- for who's in the White House. They don't have much consequence for the representative from the Third District of California.

**Obama won’t fight – he has never used political capital**

**Newsweek 10** (“Learning from LBJ,” 3-25, <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/03/25/learning-from-lbj.html>)

It's called "the treatment." All presidents administer it, one way or another. The trick is to use the perks of the office and the power of personality to bring around doubters and foes. LBJ was the most outlandish and sometimes outrageous practitioner. With three televisions blasting in the background, Johnson would get about six inches away from the face of some beleaguered or balky senator or cabinet secretary. Sometimes LBJ would beckon the man into the bathroom and continue to cajole or harangue while he sat on the toilet. Air Force One is a favorite tool presidents use to inspire and overawe. With much guffawing and backslapping, recalcitrant lawmakers are led to a luxurious cabin where they are granted a presidential audience and bestowed with swag, like cuff links with the presidential seal (Johnson gave away plastic busts of himself). Dennis Kucinich, seven-term congressman from Ohio and potential vote-switcher for health reform, was invited aboard Air Force One a couple of weeks before the climactic vote in the House. He had dealt with Presidents Clinton and Bush before, but Obama was different. The president was sitting in shirt sleeves behind a desk, computer to one side, notepad and pen at the ready. "He doesn't twist arms," recalls Kucinich. Rather, the president quietly listened. He was "all business," and sat patiently while Kucinich expressed his concerns, which Obama already knew. Then the president laid out his own arguments. Kucinich wasn't persuaded by the president, he told NEWSWEEK. But he voted for the bill because he did not want the presidency to fail, and he was convinced Obama would work with him in future. A president's first year in office is often a time for learning. The harshest lessons are beginners' mistakes, like the Bay of Pigs fiasco for JFK. The real key is to figure out how to use the prestige of the office to get things done: when to conserve your political capital, and when and how to spend it. Judging from Obama's campaign, which revolutionized politics with its ability to tap grassroots networks of donors and activists, many expected President Obama to go over the heads of Congress and mobilize popular passions to achieve his top priorities. But on what may be his signature issue, that wasn't really the case. Obama came close to prematurely ending his effectiveness as president before finally pulling out the stops. In the last push for the health-care bill, he reminded voters of Obama the candidate, fiery and full of hope. But during the health-reform bill's long slog up and around Capitol Hill, Obama was a strangely passive figure. He sometimes seemed more peeved than engaged. His backers naturally wondered why he seemed to abandon the field to the tea partiers. The answer may be that at some level he just doesn't like politics, not the way Bill Clinton or LBJ or a "happy warrior" like Hubert Humphrey thrived on the press of flesh, the backroom deal, and the roar of the crowd. That doesn't mean Obama can't thrive or be successful—even Richard Nixon was elected to two terms. But it does mean that the country is run by what New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd wryly called "the conquering professor"—a president who leads more from the head than the heart, who often relies more on listening than preaching. Obama entered politics as a community organizer, and as a presidential candidate he oversaw an operation that brilliantly organized from the ground up. So it was a puzzle to Marshall Ganz, a longtime community organizer, that Obama seemed to neglect the basic rule of a grassroots organizer: to mobilize and, if necessary, polarize your popular base against a common enemy. Instead, President Obama seemed to withdraw and seek not to offend while Congress squabbled. "It was a curiously passive strategy," says Ganz, who worked for 16 years with Cesar Chavez and the United Farm Workers and now teaches at Harvard's Kennedy School. In a way, he says, Obama's "fear of a small conflict made a big conflict inevitable."

#### History and empirics prove Obama PC irrelevant

Norman Ornstein is a long-time observer of Congress and politics. He is a contributing editor and columnist for National Journal and The Atlantic and is an election eve analyst for BBC News. He served as codirector of the AEI-Brookings Election Reform Project and participates in AEI's Election Watch series. 5-8-2013 <http://www.aei.org/article/politics-and-public-opinion/executive/the-myth-of-presidential-leadership/>

The theme of presidential leadership is a venerated one in America, the subject of many biographies and an enduring mythology about great figures rising to the occasion. The term “mythology” doesn’t mean that the stories are inaccurate; Lincoln, the wonderful Steven Spielberg movie, conveyed a real sense of that president’s remarkable character and drive, as well as his ability to shape important events. Every president is compared to the Lincoln leadership standard and to those set by other presidents, and the first 100 days of every term becomes a measure of how a president is doing.¶ I have been struck by this phenomenon a lot recently, because at nearly every speech I give, someone asks about President Obama’s failure to lead. Of course, that question has been driven largely by the media, perhaps most by Bob Woodward. When Woodward speaks, Washington listens, and he has pushed the idea that Obama has failed in his fundamental leadership task—not building relationships with key congressional leaders the way Bill Clinton did, and not “working his will” the way LBJ or Ronald Reagan did.¶ Now, after the failure to get the background-check bill through the Senate, other reporters and columnists have picked up on the same theme, and I have grown increasingly frustrated with how the mythology of leadership has been spread in recent weeks. I have yelled at the television set, “Didn’t any of you ever read Richard Neustadt’s classic Presidential Leadership? Haven’t any of you taken Politics 101 and read about the limits of presidential power in a separation-of-powers system?”¶ But the issue goes beyond that, to a willful ignorance of history. No one schmoozed more or better with legislators in both parties than Clinton. How many Republican votes did it get him on his signature initial priority, an economic plan? Zero in both houses. And it took eight months to get enough Democrats to limp over the finish line. How did things work out on his health care plan? How about his impeachment in the House?¶ No one knew Congress, or the buttons to push with every key lawmaker, better than LBJ. It worked like a charm in his famous 89th, Great Society Congress, largely because he had overwhelming majorities of his own party in both houses. But after the awful midterms in 1966, when those swollen majorities receded, LBJ’s mastery of Congress didn’t mean squat.¶ No one defined the agenda or negotiated more brilliantly than Reagan. Did he “work his will”? On almost every major issue, he had to make major compromises with Democrats, including five straight years with significant tax increases. But he was able to do it—as he was able to achieve a breakthrough on tax reform—because he had key Democrats willing to work with him and find those compromises.¶ For Obama, we knew from the get-go that he had no Republicans willing to work with him. As Robert Draper pointed out in his book Do Not Ask What Good We Do, key GOP leaders such as Eric Cantor and Paul Ryan determined on inauguration eve in January 2009 that they would work to keep Obama and his congressional Democratic allies from getting any Republican votes for any of his priorities or initiatives. Schmoozing was not going to change that.¶ Nor would arm-twisting. On the gun-control vote in the Senate, the press has focused on the four apostate Democrats who voted against the Manchin-Toomey plan, and the unwillingness of the White House to play hardball with Democrat Mark Begich of Alaska. But even if Obama had bludgeoned Begich and his three colleagues to vote for the plan, the Democrats would still have fallen short of the 60 votes that are now the routine hurdle in the Senate—because 41 of 45 Republicans voted no. And as Sen. Pat Toomey, R-Pa., has said, several did so just to deny Obama a victory.¶ Indeed, the theme of presidential arm-twisting again ignores history. Clinton once taught Sen. Richard Shelby of Alabama a lesson, cutting out jobs in Huntsville, Ala. That worked well enough that Shelby switched parties, joined the Republicans, and became a reliable vote against Clinton. George W. Bush and Karl Rove decided to teach Sen. Jim Jeffords a lesson, punishing dairy interests in Vermont. That worked even better—he switched to independent status and cost the Republicans their Senate majority. Myths are so much easier than reality.

## TPP Bad

### 2ac TPP bad – laundry list

#### TPP hampers economic growth, destroys environmental protection, and makes disease outbreaks inevitable

Louv ’14 (Jason Louv is the editor-in-chief of Ultraculture and has written for Boing Boing, VICE News, Motherboard and more. His books include Monsanto vs. the World, Queen Valentine, Thee Psychick Bible, Ultraculture Journal and Generation Hex, Vice, “The Trans-Pacific Partnership Could 'Establish a War of All Against All'”, <https://news.vice.com/article/the-trans-pacific-partnership-could-establish-a-war-of-all-against-all>, July 11, 2014)

The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is coming, and it could give multinational corporations even more influence over global policy. That's what critics of the trade deal between 12 countries along the Pacific Rim (Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, the United States, and Vietnam) are saying. It's not helping that the contents of the agreement have largely been kept secret, even though the TPP is the biggest trade deal since the creation of the World Trade Organization in 1995. The TPP partner countries are currently conducting their 20th round of talks, scheduled to last until July 12, in Ottawa, Canada. The venue was moved from Vancouver at the last minute, which critics of the agreement are saying was a calculated move to avoid protests. (Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper's government has stated that the event was moved solely to save more than $150,000 in hosting costs.) 'It would be a punch in the face to the middle class of America. But I can't tell you why.' Both President Barack Obama and Japanese negotiator Koji Tsuruoka have stated that the Canadian meetings will be a crucial step toward a planned November finish for the talks, which largely hinge on negotiations between the US and Japan. What's known about the TPP's 29 chapters — of which only five cover trade, and only three have been leaked — has sent chills through activists on both ends of the political spectrum. Here's a breakdown of the five biggest issues the TPP presents: It's Being Kept Secret From the World Thanks to leaks published by Citizens Trade Campaign and WikiLeaks, we've seen draft chapters of the environmental, investment and intellectual property sections of the TPP. But the rest is a mystery, and mainstream media coverage has been scant. Obama himself has remarked that "objections, protest, rumors" and "conspiracy theories" around the TPP are inevitable, reflecting a "lack of knowledge of what is going on in the negotiations." That "lack of knowledge" isn't elective, however. Though TPP stakeholders, including 600 corporations and multiple labor unions, including the AFL-CIO, are allowed access to the draft, the public is not. Even Congress is being kept on a short leash — while a few Congress members have been allowed to read draft text of the trade agreement, they've also been sworn to secrecy about what they've seen. 'Staffers from the Trade Representative's office insisted on staying in the room and looking at me as I read the document.' "I read some sections of a draft of the TPP that identified sections that were still being negotiated, that did not identify what positions were being taken by which countries," Florida Representative Alan Grayson told VICE News. "I was the first member [of the House] to read it; since then, other members have read it. Aides were excluded on all counts, and I was told I couldn't discuss it or shouldn't discuss it with aides. "A number of staffers from the Trade Representative's office came, brought the document with them, and insisted on staying in the room and looking at me as I read the document." His general take on what he read, even if he can't reveal the details? "It would be a punch in the face to the middle class of America. But I can't tell you why." Fair Trade found to be failing farm workers and the poor. Read more here. It Will Extend the Ability of Corporations to Sue Governments The investor-state dispute settlement provision (ISDS) of the TPP would allow foreign investors to sue governments over domestic policy that might diminish their profits. Hypothetically, for instance, an agribusiness company could sue a country that bans GMOs in order to recoup lost profits. This has already been possible, to some extent, under NAFTA — as in the cases "Eli Lilly v. Canada" and "Metalclad v. Mexico" — yet these rules do not apply to countries governed by the WTO. The TPP would extend NAFTA-style ISDS to the 12 participating countries. 'A foreign investor could drag governments to face a kangaroo court staffed by three corporate private sector attorneys.' Lori Wallach, the director of Public Citizen's Global Trade Watch, told VICE News that the ISDS "would formalize the elevation of individual corporations and investors to equal status with nation states." "It makes a public treaty between two countries privately enforceable by any private investor or corporation… a foreign investor could challenge any government policy or action in an extrajudicial tribunal outside the domestic courts, outside the domestic law, and drag governments to face a kangaroo court staffed by three corporate private sector attorneys." Child workers are getting nicotine poisoning on US tobacco farms. Read more here. It Will Put a Stranglehold on Intellectual Property Law The TPP would potentially make it criminal to break Digital Rights Management restrictions (whether you know it's a crime or not), would extend the length of time companies can hold copyright for, expand the statutory damages for copyright infringement, and even backdoor in a version of SOPA. Maira Sutton, global policy analyst at the Electronic Frontier Foundation, told VICE News that such measures could create a "censorship by copyright" situation in which we'd have "YouTubes, links on search results, academic papers, and posts on Reddit disappearing because rights holders allege it's copyrighted content. And we'd have people being afraid to link to things or share things." The TPP may also extend patent protection on pharmaceuticals —potentially meaning that crucial, life-saving medicines could be kept out of the price range of the developing world, with generics delayed or blocked from coming to market. It Will Allow Open Season on the Environment The TPP's environment chapter isn't disturbing as much for what it contains as what it doesn't contain. Though the Obama administration previously took a hard line on environmental protections, those measures have become a casualty of the TPP negotiation process, as partner countries have protested that environmental protections would limit economic growth. As such, only suggestions for environmental protection are included in the TPP — no binding obligations or enforcement policies. Company that leaked chemicals in drinking water fined only $11,000 — and that's okay. Read more here. It Will Allow Multinationals to Brutalize the Partner Countries It's not hard to extrapolate how the global situation might shift if what we've seen of the TPP were fully exploited by multinationals. Tight controls on pharmaceutical patents could potentially lead to a resurgence of HIV/AIDS and other diseases in developing TPP countries. The ability of the internet to bring information and education to developing countries could be shuttered. The environment of the partner states could be destroyed without remorse or recourse. And due to fear of economic assault under the investor-state dispute settlement provision, national governments would likely be unable to effectively fight back against multinational rule. 'In large part, what you'd see is something between corporate rule and anarchy.' Domestically, the US could also be flooded by dangerously sub-standard products, lose more jobs to offshoring, lose "Buy American" procurement policies, and face the rollback of climate and financial protections. Grayson is ferociously clear about what the effect will be: "The TPP would destroy our ability to govern ourselves. In large part, what you'd see is something between corporate rule and anarchy… It establishes a Hobbesian war of all against all."

#### ISDS results in extinction

Hart, 13 (Ron, administrator at Eradicating Ecocide in Canada a Non-profit organization pursuing legal reforms, “Corporatism and the Road to Global Ecocide,” 12/8, <http://ecocidealert.com/?p=2532>)

Always cheerleaders for corporatism and the 1%, neo-liberal economists have trotted out the idea that we must cut public services, eliminate public support programs, and depress wages to balance national budgets and drive economic growth. As a result, transnational corporations, aided by ever-expanding money sequences, have succeeded in looting the public purse, pillaging the people’s wealth held in common, and have led the race to the bottom in employment standards. In a mindless search for “growth”–ignoring climate science, ignoring planetary boundaries, ignoring the life-support purpose of production–economies based on planned obsolescence and the production of non-essential, not-needed stuff have succeeded in leaving a trail of environmental pollution of our land, water, and air–the basic elements of life essential for us to be able to take our next breath. Through opaque and secret trade agreements designed primarily for investor protection, the ability of national governments to act as trustees for the environment has been severely compromised. Ultimately, the 1%, the giant economic leaches who ignore climate change and global ecocide, control our economies and greedily suck any ‘profit’ and any remaining life still available for exploitation. Corporatism fuels an inevitable, built-in race to global ecocide.

#### diseases lead to extinction

Casadevall 12 – Prof @ Department of Microbiology and Immunology and the Division of Infectious Diseases of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine Arturo. (“The future of biological warfare,” Microbial Biotechnology, p. 584-5)

In considering the importance of biological warfare as a subject for concern it is worthwhile to review the known existential threats. At this time this writer can identify at three major existential threats to humanity: (i) large-scale thermonuclear war followed by a nuclear winter, (ii) a planet killing asteroid impact and (iii) infectious disease. To this trio might be added climate change making the planet uninhabitable. Of the three existential threats the first is deduced from the inferred cataclysmic effects of nuclear war. For the second there is geological evidence for the association of asteroid impacts with massive extinction (Alvarez, 1987). As to an existential threat from microbes recent decades have provided unequivocal evidence for the ability of certain pathogens to cause the extinction of entire species. Although infectious disease has traditionally not been associated with extinction this view has changed by the finding that a single chytrid fungus was responsible for the extinction of numerous amphibian species (Daszak et al., 1999; Mendelson et al., 2006). Previously, the view that infectious diseases were not a cause of extinction was predicated on the notion that many pathogens required their hosts and that some proportion of the host population was naturally resistant. However, that calculation does not apply to microbes that are acquired directly from the environment and have no need for a host, such as the majority of fungal pathogens. For those types of host–microbe interactions it is possible for the pathogen to kill off every last member of a species without harm to itself, since it would return to its natural habitat upon killing its last host. Hence, from the viewpoint of existential threats environmental microbes could potentially pose a much greater threat to humanity than the known pathogenic microbes, which number somewhere near 1500 species (Cleaveland et al., 2001; Tayloret al., 2001), especially if some of these species acquired the capacity for pathogenicity as a consequence of natural evolution or bioengineering.

### 1ar TPP bad – laundry list

#### Most qualified experts agree the ISDS makes warming inevitable, and collapses trade and disease prevention

Hickey 9/15 (Roger Hickey, Worked at Campaign for America's Future, “Economist Jeffrey Sachs Says NO to the TPP and the TAFTA Trade Treaties”, <http://ourfuture.org/20140915/economist-jeffrey-sachs-says-no-to-the-tpp-and-the-ttip-trade-treaties>, September 15, 2014)

The subject was the two major trade agreements that elites in both U.S. political parties are negotiating with the corporate elites in other countries: the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and Trans-Atlantic Free Trade Agreement (TAFTA) (also known as TTIP). The event was a September 10 Capitol Hill forum organized by Representatives Rosa DeLauro and George Miller, two congressional leaders concerned that corporate trade deals can undermine economic opportunity here and around the globe. They heard from of a number of experts and economists, including former economic adviser to Vice President Joe Biden, Jared Bernstein, and AFL-CIO trade economist (and deputy chief of staff) Thea Lee. But the big draw was economist Jeffrey Sachs, the Columbia University economist and Professor of Sustainable Development who also directs the Earth Institute. Sachs is a world-renowned professor of economics, leader in sustainable development, senior United Nations adviser, bestselling author, and syndicated columnist whose monthly newspaper columns appear in more than 100 countries. Below you will find both a video and transcript the Sachs and Bernstein presentations at this important public event. (Thanks to Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch.) But the key points of the Sachs presentation merit summary: Without touching on the unpopular Fast-Track mechanism necessary to pass these two treaties, Sachs laid out five reasons why, on the substance, they should not be passed or ratified: 1. They are not trade treaties, but agreements aimed at protecting investors. 2. They ignore great challenges of sustainable development: the environment and growing inequality. 3. Their investor-state dispute settlement clauses give absolutely unjustified and dangerous powers to investors vis-à-vis the state. 4. The entire process is not transparent, and this secrecy alone in reason enough to reject the two treaties. 5. Finally, he warned that the Obama administration has not presented one analysis of the cost and benefits with regard to jobs, different industries, income distribution, economic growth and trade. Both political parties are pushing the TPP and the TTIP Trade Treaties as magic bullets that, they claim will revive economic growth and job creation. When I asked him at the end of his presentation whether either treaty would have any positive impact on U.S. growth, Sachs replied with an important and very personal statement: “On general principles, I would say, that these treaties will continue to underpin and amplify the kind of globalization process that is underway right now. I’m not against all aspects of the globalization, I have to say, I do believe, by the way, in foreign direct investment, international production systems, cross-border investment and so forth. But I am completely against the kind of arrangement we have now. In fact it’s my great disappointment because I helped to bring globalization, through my own efforts and advisory work over the years, and I always envisioned that when we moved to a global system, we would move to a humane, decent global system that would recognize losers as well as winners, that would maintain standards of redistribution, that would focus on the poor, that would address market failures like environmental crises and financial crises. But our general mode of globalization has been to ignore all of the downsides and to plow ahead on emphasizing investor rights. And this is not surprising, because we’re a lobby-led government structure, and so you see what you get when you put the pharmaceutical industry or the financial sector or the other sectors as heads of the negotiations. You get narrow interests and you don’t face the broader challenge. So while I can’t give a number on the trade deficit, I would say that the kind of globalization that we have right now, which in some ways expands the pie, but does so at high costs to the poor, to many poor, to rising inequality, to more frequent financial crises, and to a growing environmental catastrophe. Nothing that I know of these two treaties would do anything but continue us along that course, perhaps accelerated. These are not 21st century treaties that start out with our goals; these are 20th century treaties continuing to build the flawed globalization that we have underway.” Watch a video of the forum. International Trade Forum on Free Trade Agreements Hosted by Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro & Congressman George Miller September 10, 2014 Remarks from Keynote Speaker Professor Jeffrey Sachs Congresswoman, thank you so much, and thank you for holding this forum. It is extremely timely and indeed very important. The United States is engaged, of course, in two major negotiations on trade and investment — both the TPP and the TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. These are extraordinarily important. I wish we knew more about them. They’re all so secret. There are leaks, there are snippets, there are people here who are engaged in some of the negotiations, but the public is not engaged. So a lot of what we say is a bit speculative. The fact that the public is not engaged means that we should worry because we do know that when things are managed in secret, as these negotiations have been, it’s the organized and powerful interests that by far dominate the proceedings. These are largely industry- and lobby-driven activities. They are not yet in any way proved to be in the interest of American people, and this is a matter of significant concern. This is called an international trade forum, but we should be clear that it’s an international trade and investment forum. Because perhaps at least as much as trade, it is the opening of the world in the last thirty years to financial flows and foreign direct investment that have reshaped the world economy. And these two treaties are primarily investment treaties even more than trade treaties. Although trade is an issue, the regulations and procedures and standards governing international investment are also very much at stake and in many ways extremely worrisome. Let me start with a very general economic proposition, and that is that international trade and investment can be a force for mutual good of all parties in fact. But a second proposition that’s sometimes forgotten in the rah-rah of free trade rhetoric is that simply open trade or open investment by itself has no guarantee of meeting the criterion of raising wellbeing broadly, much less across the board. The first thing that one learns in the first week of trade class is that trade has effects both on the size of economies, but also on the income distribution. There can be winners as well as losers. And in general, in trade class you learn by the second week that in order to have a widespread improvement from trade, there has to be some kind of redistribution that goes along with the trade policy to compensate losers in the process of also enjoying the benefits. We live in a society however, that not only does not have such redistribution, but redistribution goes in the opposite direction in the last thirty years. The redistribution is mostly from the poor or middle class to the rich, rather than the other way around. And there’s nothing in these trade agreements, trade and investment agreements, that are being negotiated, that even address the issues of redistribution. The second thing that one learns in trade theory is that, in a world of many so-called market failures, externalities, spill-overs across the borders, and these come in many shapes and forms – they come in financial crises; they come in the form of environmental crises; they can come in the form of health crises – trade by itself does not necessarily improve the situation if these spill-overs or external effects are also not being addressed. And therefore when President Obama talks about TPP and TTIP being 21st century trade agreements, the starting point should be that the phenomena of globalization more generally, the extent of financial crises, the growing environmental catastrophe worldwide of climate change and loss of biodiversity, the crises of international disease (such as we now have with Ebola in West Africa) need to be not only considered as footnotes. And they’re not even that in any way. They need to be in the forefront of our international economic relations. In other words, trade and investment treaties need to work for solutions in those areas and certainly not to exacerbate these crises. I would say from all that we know, and unfortunately I can’t tell you that I know the latest script of either of these treaties. I do not, I have not read a copy of the 29 chapters of TPP. I do not know what’s on the negotiating table. But from what I do know, we have a lot of reason to worry. All the considerations that make international trade and investment potentially beneficial are not being joined by the kinds of policy measures that are needed to ensure that they are in fact beneficial. So I don’t want to come here in the guise of anti-trade or anti-investment, I want to speak in a position of what I think is responsibility to core goals: to core standards of fairness, to environmental sustainability, to narrowing income inequalities that have reached historic highs in our country, and that will be exacerbated by many of the things that are proposed by at least some of the actors right now. And in that sense I can’t support either of these negotiations with what I see now. I think that they would distract us from the more important global issues. I don’t think they rise close to the standard of being 21st century trade and investment agreements, not even close. They are very much 20th century agreements which were already out of date by the time they were negotiated. This is a NAFTA treaty writ large, or this is the same negotiation that we’ve had in many other cases. Our country has not taken up the leadership on income distribution, inequality, environmental degradation at a global scale, the global health crises adequately and so on. So let me make a few observations and then recommendations. First, let’s keep in mind in our own rhetoric, that these proposed agreements are mostly investor protection agreements, rather than trade agreements. There are trade elements in them, but this is mostly about investor protection: investor protection of property rights of investors, of prerogatives of investors, of IP of investors, of the regulatory environment of investors, and so forth. Recognizing that, we have some reasons to support some of these issues, but a lot of reasons for worry, because it’s not true that everything that is in the investor’s interest is in the worker’s interest. Its’ not true that everything that’s in the investor’s interest is in the broad interest of the American people or the people in host countries where the American investment may be going, or in the same way, investment that could be coming into this country. So we’re talking about mainly investment rules. And trade, which is already quite liberalized in the straightforward trade manner, doesn’t change all that much from what we know of these treaties. These are basically not trade agreements. They are investment agreements. Second point is that I see no evidence that these proposed arrangements focus on the great challenges of sustainable development, which I believe to be the core challenges of our time. By sustainable development I mean the triple challenge of economic improvement, social inclusion, and environmental sustainability. These treaties do not focus on the challenges of poverty. They do not focus on the challenges of inequality of income and its sharp rise in the last generation and its continuing rise even in recent years. Nor do they focus on the issues of the environment, except perhaps in a negative way, I would say. There is reportedly to be an environmental standard here, but I worry more that investor prerogatives will be given preference over environmental needs, and there’s very little to really give us confidence that environmental issues are at the forefront. If they were, I’m sure that most of the supporters of these agreements on the Republican side would be against them for all the wrong reasons. But the fact that they’re so enthusiastic is because there’s very little protection indeed for the environmental issues. A third point, which has become notorious in these agreements, which I think is notorious correctly, is the whole issue of investor-state dispute settlement. And, to my mind, it is quite alarming that the administration seems until this day to be pushing something which more and more observers, participants, legal scholars view as out of control So, as I’m sure that most or all of you know, there is an investor-state dispute settlement mechanism proposed in both TPP and TTIP. And the problem with this is that it creates an extra-legal venue for arbitration that has proven in many investment treaties in recent years to be highly deleterious for basic government regulatory processes and especially around issues of health, safety, environment, and other issues. The idea is essentially that this new mechanism — rather, the mechanism proposed here which is already part of many bilateral treaties and some multilateral investment treaties — is giving more and more power to investors to challenge general government regulatory actions. Not breach of specific investment contracts, but general regulatory and legislative actions on the claim that those general regulatory or legislative actions are against the interests of the investors and somehow therefore violate the implicit standards or guarantees that these investors have vis-à-vis the host countries. In other words, standards of general applicability against smoking or for environmental protection, or for taxation of natural resources and so forth are now coming under challenge in these investor-state dispute arbitration panels and forcing governments — the host governments — to back down or rescind or, in the face of a lost arbitration, to cancel laws of general applicability, and therefore to lose the sovereign right to pursue national interest at the face of investor interest. Well you can imagine why America’s most powerful multi-national companies would like such an arrangement. And this is the sense in which these treaties really are investor treaties first, and trade treaties a distant second. This investor-state dispute clause has been widely attacked. The German government has spoken out strongly, with strong reservations about it. Legal scholars across the United States more and more are expressing alarm at how these clauses have gotten out of hand, given absolutely unjustified and dangerous powers to investors vis-à-vis the state. Yet as far as I know, and since I’m not an insider to this, I don’t know for sure, but as far as I know the United States government continues to press this clause today. I regard that alone as reason to oppose both of these treaties. If this remains in place, it is absolutely in the wrong direction. And, these clauses have proven to be increasingly dangerous and I’ve seen publicly no response to this at all. Fourth, as the Congresswoman rightly stressed, this entire process is not transparent, and this is why TPA should absolutely never be accepted in this context. But I think in the end it’s why both treaties or both partnership agreements are likely to go down as well. Because, the idea that the administration’s just going to present a completed document to the public and then basically say even if there isn’t TPA formally, well take it or leave it, we can’t really negotiate with this, is in the end, I believe, going to be politically toxic for all the understandable reasons. I don’t understand how something of such vast significance for billions of people could even presume to be treated in this manner. One could imagine that negotiations over very specific tariff rates or very specific numerical clauses in some of these chapters could be held privately. But the idea that the main text around issues as broad as investor protection, dispute settlement, taxation, financial flows, intellectual property, would be done secretly, is shocking actually to me. If it were purely an issue of quantification of a specific tariff for a six-digit SITC code sector, it’s understandable perhaps that it would take… that one would not have the numbers published day-by-day. But we’re talking about the basic rules of the international economy for the three major regions of the world. There is no reason in the world I can see for this text not to be public, not to be publicly vetted, and not to be updated over time. And the fact that it isn’t is a huge tactical mistake in my opinion of the administration anyway, but makes it untenable for us to get support for this process. Finally, there is as far as I can see, not one single analysis by the administration. And of course, none in detail by anybody else. Because we don’t know about the costs and benefits and implications of these proposed agreements. What would they mean? What would the implications be for jobs, sectors, income distribution, growth, trade. Not that economics is up to the task of giving precise answers to that. But still, before launching into such a potentially large and disruptive set of arrangements, one does an analysis of what it means, and I don’t see any evidence, I don’t even see the case that the administration’s making, except on general principles, which I don’t find compelling for the reasons I’ve explained about what the consequences would be. So, how could we actually perceive without some sense of quantification and analysis of the basic implications? I think the answer is we could not proceed in that way. So, my recommendation is that there should be, proposed by the members of Congress, a statement of principles that are a baseline for going ahead on this and I would include the following: First, that the interim draft should be posted. And further drafts should be available for public comment. This is a basic standard of functional good governance. Second, that the administration is committed to providing a detailed, quantified analysis of the implications of these two treaties, and one that will be made available sufficiently ahead of time for commentary and for additional analyses by other interested parties. Third, that trade and investment agreements of the 21st century identify the primacy of the goals. The goals are not processes. The goals are not to strengthen investor rights. The goals should be goals of job creation in the signatory countries, good living standards for workers, environmental protection, including facing the major challenges of climate change, loss of biodiversity – and assistance and distributive policies to help those who would be losers in what otherwise is potentially a winning hand for all of the countries involved. Those are basic standards, it seems to me, that need to be acknowledged, recognized and put forward. And then the actual agreement can be tested against those standards. Does this agreement actually fulfill those needs? Fourth, I would say, should be a clear statement about the primacy of every country’s sovereign right and responsibility to pursue sustainable development over specific clauses of trade and investment that might be agreed. Just so there’s no misunderstanding: these agreements must not stand in the way of effectively addressing climate change, for example, which is the largest environmental issue that humanity has ever faced. And yet it’s quite conceivable that there would be barriers to effective regulation on climate change as a result of the TTIP and the TPP. And unless there’s a clear statement about the need for sovereign governments to have responsibility and for trade and investment rules not to impede on taking basic measures for public health, for the environment, and for the general public welfare then I would say that it takes huge risks. Fifth, and in that same regard, either the investor-state dispute settlement provision is dropped altogether. Or it is dramatically limited in scope and application, in line with many recommendations that have been made by the legal community: by exhaustion clauses on state law, as some German government officials propose, and so on. That proposed new provision should be scrutinized carefully by the legal community, by the practitioner community. But in general, I believe that the investor-state dispute settlement clause should be dropped from these agreements. And sixth, I would also urge that these treaties be analyzed from the point of view of international taxation. We have an utter crisis of corporate irresponsibility and loopholes that we are seeing play out day-by-day. Tax inversions with all of the incredible manipulations of our leading companies, Apple and Google and Starbucks and others are marquee names who have figured out how to use the international legal structure to avoid paying taxes that are rightly due. I believe that these two new treaties, the partnership proposals, could further undermine international taxation and I would put a special look on that because this is a crisis and it’s gutting our capacity as a country to function and to address the needs that I have been emphasizing. So those are my suggestions, and I thank you very much. Questions: Sam Cho, Legislative Fellow with Congressman Ami Bera: As you mentioned several times in your speech, these agreements are really investment agreements. This means essentially freer mobility of capital will result. If you were a legislator, what safeguards would you look for in the actual agreement that would essentially hedge us from potential financial crises stemming from the capital account deficit? Sachs: There are two main kinds of financial flows. One is foreign direct investment which is generally long term, more stable and aimed at operations overseas. The other is portfolio investment, which is much more volatile, and really the source of a lot of the financial crises in the last 25 years. Most of our serious financial crises, like 2008 or Asia 1997, are sudden dramatic liquidity crises, which come from panics. Lehman Brothers induced the 2008 panic; the baht devaluation in 1997 induced the Asian panic and as soon as those panics break out, then the interbank lines of credit dry up, short term liquidity dries up and economies are pushed into an extremely deep crisis. International capital flows are especially vulnerable; they dry up very. very quickly. That’s why from September 14, 2008 until around September 18, 2008, in one week the entire world economy was brought into the Wall Street Crisis. It was the most dramatic global scale financial crisis we have ever seen and well, certainly, the fastest because even the Great Depression rolled out over the course of two years with the bank failures, whereas this dried up international liquidity in one week. I’m quite sure this is not being addressed in this treaty making because there’s just very weak governance about these issues in general and the economics profession is not so good on these issues because mainstream macroeconomics isn’t about this and there’s a lot to say, but the idea that we just push forward liberalization of cross-border finance without due regard for the safeguards needed for liquidity crises would be adding fuel to this fire. And so there are many questions about how long-term foreign direct investment should be handled. That goes to questions of income distribution, labor standards, environment standards, and so forth, the things I talked about. The short-term portfolio flow, to the extent that that is pushed in these treaties, for example, general clauses that capital markets should liberalize, I don’t know what’s in these clauses, but if that were the nature of these clauses, it would add danger and fragility to the world markets rather than stability. To get stability, one would need a rather thorough — which we are not going to get through this administration or in this context — a rather thorough structure bulwark to be able to both prevent and face these liquidity crises. But after 2008 we did not make any deep forms on international financial liquidity management, I would say, only very ad hoc measures, and they won’t be part of this treaty. It’s too complicated. So this treaty may be neutral on this subject, possibly negative, just opening up more without the safety net underneath it, but it will not be positive and constructive on this. Brandon Mendoza, office of Congresswoman Susan Davis: Given the stance that you want the most amount of nimbleness in regards to responding to financial crises, liquidity crises, would you advise against including currency measures in the trade agreement? Sachs: I am not a great fan of the currency manipulation measures myself, just because I know from 35 years of work in international finance, that one country’s currency manipulation is another country’s monetary policy and vice-versa. And the standards of what this means are, in my view, not so easily defined. Some of my best friends in Congress view otherwise, so I don’t want to push the point too hard, except to say that I do not believe that these are the places for currency issues to be resolved. I think that a preformed international monetary system and using the institutions of the Bretton Woods, especially the IMF framework, is the place where those issues should be taken up. There was good reason in 1944 to vest the exchange rate issues there, things have gotten a lot more complicated since 1944. Then it was just trying to think about how to re-open an international monetary system; now are a managing, and not managing well, a global financial market with trillions of dollars in transactions per day. And so in this sense, we’re not up to it yet. That’s why we have these very deep, periodic crises — and do not believe they are under control. I have been working in those fields for more than three decades and we have not made institutional progress on this in a deep way. I personally wouldn’t put it in here. It’s just not the place to handle this, in my opinion, and we need a multilateral framework to handle exchange rate issues. When it’s purely done in a bilateral way, it’s easy for the two to say, “You’re unfair, you’re too weak, you’re too weak, you’re manipulating, you’re manipulating” and I think in the end, it’s actually not so fruitful. In general, it’s disappointing that after the 2008 crisis we didn’t have a major clear sense of overall of these issues. They’re not easy, but they were beyond the reach. Roger Hickey, Campaign for America’s Future: Can you tell us what you think these two treaties’ impact would be on the ballooning U.S. trade deficit? Sachs: No, because I haven’t seen the treaties and I really feel that it’s very hard to give a quantitation on that. On general principles, I would say, that these treaties will continue to underpin the kind of globalization process that is underway right now. So they will not change direction, but amplify the current direction. I’m not against all aspects of the globalization, I have to say, I do believe, by the way, in foreign direct investment, international production systems, cross-border investment and so forth. And I see it also as a way to for poorer countries to develop. But I am completely against the kind of arrangement we have now. In fact it’s my great disappointment because I helped to bring globalization, through my own efforts and advisory work over the years, and I always envisioned that when we moved to a global system, we would move to a humane, decent global system that would recognize losers as well as winners, that would maintain standards of redistribution, that would focus on the poor, that would address market failures like environmental crises and financial crises. But our general mode of globalization has been to ignore all of the downsides and to plow ahead on emphasizing investor rights. And this is not surprising, because we’re a lobby-led government structure, and so you see what you get when you put the pharmaceutical industry or the financial sector or the other sectors as heads of the negotiations. You get narrow interests and you don’t face the broader challenge. So while I can’t give a number on the trade deficit, I would say that the kind of globalization that we have right now, which in some ways expands the pie, but does so at high costs to the poor, to many poor, to rising inequality, to more frequent financial crises, and to a growing environmental catastrophe. Nothing that I know of these two treaties would do anything but continue us along that course, perhaps accelerated. These are not 21st century treaties that start out with our goals; these are 20th century treaties continuing to build the flawed globalization that we have underway. Remarks from Jared Bernstein Senior Fellow, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities I’m going to be brief. But I’m going to stand here so I can see people who I can’t see if I am sitting there. Thank you very much Congresswoman for inviting me and for holding the forum. In five to seven minutes, I want to amplify some of the points that Jeff made so trenchantly and effectively – although I have a strong disagreement with one point on the currency chapter, which I will emphasize. So I want to talk the role of trade agreements and trade deficits, something Roger Hickey [from Campaign for American Future] asked about a second ago; the relationship between these issues and income inequality; and then say a word about fiscal concerns because I think there is a linkage there that’s really important. And, we are in a building where fiscal concern looms large. I strongly view TPP without a currency chapter one that clearly disallows currency management or manipulation as an export subsidy as a non-tariff barrier. Such a trade agreement should always be opposed and particularly strongly in this case. I really try to avoid arguing with people who aren’t here to argue back. And Jeff is a very capable arguer. But I think he has left. So I’ll make sure to follow up with him on this myself because I want to give him the opportunity to argue with me about this. But in fact, what I kind of heard him saying is that it wouldn’t work. And frankly what we are doing now isn’t working. I believe it would help, but if it didn’t, we’d be no worse off. So the idea of if there is going to be a TPP an idea of not taking that opportunity to have a chapter that prohibits, creates mechanisms by which currency management is disallowed would be, not only a missed opportunity, but would be a completely unacceptable path in my view. Why? What’s so darn important about that? Well, I’m going to get to that. But I want to talk to the issue of income inequality which is something that Congresswoman DeLauro asked me to speak to. Given time, I won’t show you — this is a rare presentation for me because I’m not using slides — I won’t show you the slide that I throw up here which basically shows the income distribution, how low, high and middle incomes have done over the past 60-70 years. And if you look between the mid-40s and, say, the mid-70s you actually have incomes growing together — low, middle, high — they just about doubled in every case. Family incomes doubled at the bottom. Believe it or not, yes, that used to happen. It doubled in the middle. And doubled at the top. So growing together, as it were, in those years. Since then, of course, they’ve really separated a great deal. Now what does this have to do with trade? Well two things: first of all, the balance of trade in the period when incomes were growing together was about zero on average. That is, the trade that was in the shared GDP was about zero, maybe slightly positive over that initial period. Over that latter period, say, the last 30-40 years, the trade deficit has been, on average, about -3% of GDP. And most recently trade deficits were in the 4-5 hundred billion range last year, so we are talking about 3-4% of GDP. I am by no means saying that that is the only variable. It is a common economic mistake, to say here’s something that happened and here’s another variable that happened at the same time; however, they are intimately linked. And the way that they are linked is very clearly through the absence of tight job markets or full employment. Remember, this is basic Econ 101. GDP is consumption plus investment plus government spending plus net exports. Now if net exports are negative, that’s a drag on GDP growth. That means less economic activity. And when we run these trade deficits, essentially, we are exporting jobs abroad. Now that doesn’t mean that you can’t have a trade deficit of some magnitude year in and year out. It happens. But the idea that we’ve run substantial deficits since 1976 is a suggestion that something is deeply imbalanced in global accounts. So the relationship, just to be clear, between trade and inequality runs through slower growth, weaker labor markets, the absence of full employment. And the relationship between that and trade agreements or TPP has to do with some of our trading partners who manage the dollar. This is not a secret. In fact I like to call it, management versus manipulation, because manipulation sounds so secretive and like some sort of evil plot. If you plot the Chinese currency against the U.S. dollar, it goes straight for a while and then it wiggles about, which you can do on the FRED database [Federal Reserve Economic Database] in about 30 seconds. Let’s call that management, because it’s not really a secret. The idea of dealing with that in a trade deal like the TPP is one that I think many opponents of the agreement support. Most recently I read a paper, written just a few months ago by Fred Bergsten at PIIE [Peterson Institute for International Economics] and certainly no rabid opponent of tradeand I thought it was an excellent piece of work, which was precisely about the need for a currency chapter and even articulating how that chapter would work. So, I can say more about these relationships during the Q&A, including some ideas as to what you might put in such a chapter to reduce this export subsidy and import tariff. But let me just say briefly, the idea that I liked the best, and I say this sometimes surprising people, is simply legislating reciprocity. That is, if a country can buy our Treasuries, we have to be able to buy theirs. Now, you might think that, “don’t we already have that? If China, if Korea goes out, if Singapore goes out and buys a bunch of Treasury bills in order to boost the value of the dollar relative to their currency to make sure that their exports to us are cheap and ours to them are more expensive. Can’t we go out and do the same thing?” The answer is no. So simply having that kind of reciprocity would make a big difference. Finally, I wanted to say a word about fiscal concerns. It’s funny, when I think about this question of fiscal policy, especially in recent years when we have had a weak economy. I really think it’s like that movie “Honey, I Shrunk the Kids”. You know, like “Honey, I Shrunk the Wrong Deficit”. Our focus on shrinking the budget deficit, in a time of a weak, private sector economy — that’s called austerity — has been a very serious problem and a major contributor to what has been a pretty weak recovery, relative to targeting the trade deficit. And one of the reasons that come to mind is that, in fact, I’ve tried to make these connections between the trade deficit and weaker growth, the absence of full employment. When we’ve actually had a better fiscal outlook, in the latter 1990s, for example, one of the things that helped us get there was full employment. Now you might be saying: “but we had trade deficits then?” And the fact is we did. And we offset them with the bubble just like we offset them with the bubble in the 2000s. If you are running a trade deficit of that magnitude, you either have to offset it with a bubble, with a big budget deficit or you have to live with higher unemployment. On the fiscal front, where the TPP really comes in — and this is from the paper by Paul Van De Water when he wrote for the Center on Budget Priorities, where I work — the concern there is that the TPP would restrict Medicare’s ability to limit the prices it pays for, say, Part B beneficiaries by allowing drug companies to challenge some of the payment policies that now hold down the costs of drug purchases. TPP could raise health costs by expanding patent protection for both drugs and medical devices. This is all in the Van De Water paper. And the TPP could give companies an avenue to challenge policies that the U.S. is trying to pursue to actually control these costs. Our fiscal health in the future goes directly through the kinds of cost controls that we are trying to build into the Affordable Care Act and hopefully into the stronger negotiating for lower medical prices that comes from the government as a single payer in the case as, say, Medicare or Medicaid. The TPP threatens to block that and I think we should have great fiscal concerns about those outcomes. Thank you.
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\*The deal is everything wrong with past trade deals on steroids (cuz we are doing it with 11 countries, that’s like a lot)
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The post-NAFTA era has been marked by growing inequality, declining job security and new leverage for corporations to attack government regulations enacted in the public interest. But it wasn’t supposed to be that way. Back in 1986, when the leaders of the US, Canada and Mexico began talks on a regional trade deal that eight years later would culminate in the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), they sold the pact to the public as an economic win-win for all parties involved. On signing the treaty in 1994, then-President Bill Clinton said, “NAFTA means jobs. American jobs, and good-paying American jobs. If I didn’t believe that, I wouldn’t support this agreement.” He promised that NAFTA would result in “an export boom to Mexico,” and claimed that such trade deals “transcend ideology” because support for them “is so uniform that it unites people in both parties.” Twenty years later, we can test how those claims panned out in the real world. And Public Citizen’s Global Trade Watch did just that, releasing a comprehensive study of NAFTA’s impacts. Last week, Global Trade Watch Director Lori Wallach spoke to Moyers & Company about NAFTA at age 20, and what it portends for other trade treaties like the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Below is a transcript of the conversation, edited for clarity. Joshua Holland: Last Wednesday was the twentieth anniversary of NAFTA going into effect. Has it at least led to an increase in the trade of goods and services between the US, Canada and Mexico? Lori Wallach: That is the only measure where you can show that the promises of NAFTA’s proponents were met. The flow of goods has increased. Unfortunately, that flow has been a huge surge of imports into the United States, from Mexico, and, interestingly, from Canada, so that we’ve seen the displacement of one million jobs on net because of the huge increase — a 450 percent increase — in our trade deficit in the 20 years since NAFTA went into effect. Holland: They said that it would be a net job winner. At the time, the conventional wisdom was that there would be some job displacement but the vast majority of us would be winners in this. What about Canada and Mexico? I know Mexico’s agricultural labor market was devastated by NAFTA, as subsidized corn and other products flooded into the country, and it certainly spurred a huge wave of immigration from the south, as all those agricultural workers lost their jobs. But in terms of employment in other sectors, did it end up a net winner or loser for them? Wallach: Mexico is probably the saddest story ofNAFTA’s effect because, 20 years into the agreement, the level of employment in manufacturing there is actually down relative to its pre-NAFTA economy. Part of that is the result of NAFTA having wiped out a lot of the small and medium size production: food processing and small textile and apparel plants, and other plants that were supplying the independent mom and pop stores which were devastated by the invasion of the Wal-Marts and other big US chains. There’s a whole movement called El Barzón of folks who had been the owners of those factories or of those small retail stores, who had been for NAFTA in the beginning but are now very strong NAFTA opponents. Also, if you look at Mexico, the level of poverty has stayed the same, but income inequality has increased, and industrial wages are actually down in real terms. One statistic that really shows the failure of the free trade model is that the price paid to Mexico’s farmers for their corn dropped 80 percent within the first three years of NAFTA, as a huge flood of subsidized US corn started flowing in. But the price Mexicans pay for tortillas—a staple food—has increased almost 300 percent. Under free trade theory, some folks lose — those corn farmers lose — but everyone is supposed to get richer because prices go down. That is the theory of free trade — the consumer benefits, and the producer who loses should be compensated — and the tortilla shows how that promise has been proven false. There are many reasons for this. NAFTA wasn’t just about trade. It set up all these rules that, for instance, allowed Archer Daniels to buy up not only the processing plants for corn, but also to buy a stake in one of the biggest tortilla makers, Bimbo, which is sort of the Wonder Bread of Mexico. And as a result, you have Archer Daniels and other companies selling to themselves, and marking up the profit margin each time. So with this “competition” that free trade is supposed to create, with all these corporate rights to acquire and basically monopolize sectors, the consumer is the loser. Holland: Let’s return to the United States. We were told before NAFTA — and we hear this with every single trade deal — that this is all about opening overseas markets for our exports. But we’ve seen the opposite of that in the NAFTA context – as you mentioned, our trade deficit has exploded. Is it because our trading partners don’t like our products, or is this evidence that US multinationals move their production overseas to save on labor costs and regulations but then just re-import the products for sale right here at home? Wallach: That is what’s happening. Shortly after NAFTA, we did a very detailed dig to find all the promises of US producers who made very specific claims before the treaty was signed that ‘if NAFTA passes, we will add X number of jobs.’ So we went and looked at the federal government’s Trade Adjustment Assistance database and we found that company after company — big US manufacturers like Chrysler, GE, Caterpillar — that promised to create specific numbers of US jobs instead were offshoring thousands and thousands of US jobs to Mexico, and then they were bringing the product back into the country and selling it. It was still their US brand name, but made with much lower wages in Mexico. The trade data are very telling. The year before NAFTA, the United States had a small trade deficit with Canada — about $20 billion dollars — and a slight surplus of $2 billion dollars with Mexico. Now, 20 years later, we have almost a $200 billion dollar trade deficit with those countries. So the surplus with Mexico turned into a huge, huge deficit, as all those companies relocated there to produce goods with lower wages. And this Trade Adjustment Assistance database is really fascinating. There are 845,000 specific US workers who are certified under just this one narrow program as having lost their jobs since NAFTA to trade with Mexico and Canada. And you’d be surprised at the kinds of companies you see. In the beginning it was a huge wipeout of the auto sector, textiles and apparel, and appliances. But now it’s computers, it’s clean manufacturing of computer chips, high-end electronics, aircraft – these are high-end, high-tech, well-trained, well-paid jobs. The so-called jobs of the future are all being offshored. Even if you didn’t lose a job, what we’ve found with this study, and, more importantly, what economists, including those who supported NAFTA originally, found is that shifting a million well-paying jobs out has an effect economy-wide on wage levels and on income inequality. The statistic that is most important is what happens when those folks whose jobs were lost are reemployed. According to the Department of Labor, they lost more than 20 percent of their previous wages. So when we say that wages in real terms are flat—we’re at 1979 levels of median income, but we’re obviously not at 1979 prices — it is in large part the result of the downward pressure of this kind of trade on all of our wages. What was really different with NAFTA is that it had a whole chapter that included investor protections — special rights and privileges for companies that relocate production. Before NAFTA they wouldn’t go. They were afraid that they might get expropriated. They were afraid that they might end up with some new policy that they’d have to adjust to. And they were afraid of having to rely on the Mexican courts. But under NAFTA’s investor rules, the famous Chapter 11, there is “a minimum standard of guaranteed treatment” for any investor who moves to another country. It guaranteed compensation for regulatory changes and costs, and it created a system of tribunals, with corporate lawyers as the so-called judges. So they can easily dodge domestic courts. It was an incentive to relocate that production, make it for those low wages, then slap on the US brand and sell it back here. That’s the NAFTA trade deficit. Holland: Those investor-state tribunals are what many critics say is the most anti-democratic aspect of these trade deals. Can you tell us a little bit about their record in these first two decades of NAFTA? Wallach: Over the 20 years of NAFTA, $400 million dollars have been paid out in these investor-state lawsuits. In these cases, corporations have directly sued governments, dragging them in front of extrajudicial tribunals presided over by corporate lawyers who are empowered to order any amount of damages. There is no outside appeal There’s a whole string of cases around water rights, around timber rights. And in the most recent one, ExxonMobil is going to end up with tens of millions of dollars in a case against Canada because Canada required that for any company—US, Mexican, Canadian, a firm from Mars—any company that got an offshore oil or gas exploration permit was required to pay a fee for research on renewable energy in the future as part of the licensing process. It seems reasonable, but [under NAFTA's Chapter 11] it’s considered a forbidden performance requirement on a foreign investor, and ExxonMobil is going to get tens of millions of dollars from the Canadian government even though Canadian companies who are doing the exact same work have to pay this fee. And then there is the chilling effect, because on average it costs $8–10 million dollars to fight a Chapter 11 suit, and even if the country wins, it has to pay those costs. It’s just a second bite at the apple for corporations — a chance of getting out of regulations and trying to bully governments –because in a country like Canada or the US, where the courts work fine, there is no other reason to have these extrajudicial tribunals. And if all of this sounds bad, the Trans-Pacific Partnership — the TPP, which is under negotiation right now — is an attempt to expand NAFTA, and all of this damage — from the investor state system to the job offshoring — to 11 more countries. It is NAFTA on steroids. The good news is that 20 years of NAFTA’s damage has made Congress very suspicious, and other countries have become very suspicious of these kinds of agreements. The bad news is that the Obama Administration is hell bent on signing it, this year, in the first couple of months of this year, and is asking for fast track trade authority — the outrageous procedure that is the only reason that NAFTA got greased through Congress. It’s a procedure that takes away all of Congress’s normal operations and basically zooms a bad trade agreement through Congress with very little oversight and makes it almost impossible for the public to hold their members of Congress accountable. Holland: Lori, what questions should people ask about the TPP that weren’t asked about NAFTA? Wallach: Number one question to your member of Congress should be, have you read the actual full text of the agreement? Do you know about the investment rules that promote job offshoring? Do you know about the rules that require us to import food that doesn’t meet our safety standards? Do you know about the ban on buy American and buy local? If you don’t know, if you haven’t read those chapters—the investment chapter, the food chapter, the procurement chapter—then you cannot vote yes to approve this. Question number two: do you know this becomes binding US law limiting what Congress, states and local city councils can do as far as making domestic policy on all of these nontrade issues, and that not a word of this agreement can be changed unless all 12 countries agree? Do you understand that you are limiting the future of our democracy, indefinitely, on everything from internet freedom and our energy and climate policy to the prospect of having green jobs and an equitable economy? Do you understand that’s what you’re doing, i.e. throwing away your job as a Congressperson? And then the third question is: what single piece of evidence do you have that this trade agreement is actually going to create jobs here versus lose more US jobs and push down our wages? We now have free trade agreements with 17 countries. Show me a single one of those agreements in which we have gained jobs on net. Show me evidence from a single one of those agreements that the partner countries have reduced their poverty. Show me any of the past promises that are being repeated now by the same interests — the same corporate think tanks, the same companies — to push TPP which has come true.

**Asia Leadership**

**2ac TPP bad – Asian leadership**

**TPP dilutes US influence in Asia by exacerbating intra-Asia economic competition—alternative frameworks solve their offense**

Goto ’15 – senior associate for Northeast Asia with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars’ Asia Program based in Washington D.C.

(Shihoko, 10/22 /16, “Could the TPP Actually Divide Asia?” date accessed: 6.26.16, The Diplomat, <http://thediplomat.com/2015/10/could-the-tpp-actually-divide-asia/>)//AP

Trade deals always produce losers as well as winners, so it is no surprise that there is growing concern that the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement will not be ratified by all 12 member countries. But if it does come into force, the seemingly unshakeable assumption is that the TPP will be the foundation for continued U.S. engagement in Asia, and that it will ensure stability in a region increasingly riven by nationalism, territorial disputes, and militarism.

For now, U.S. legislators are rightly focused on the harm as well as the benefits TPP could bring. Among those expressing skepticism about the economic benefits of the TPP are Senator Orrin Hatch, chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, and it is not certain that Congress will even pass the TPP, even with Trade Promotion Authority in place. Certainly, as the U.S. presidential elections gear up, the benefits and demerits of a mega-trade deal will become a hot-button issue.

But even as the pros and cons in each sector are weighed, the White House will undoubtedly remain resolute about the security implications of the TPP. Touted as the economic component of a broader U.S. rebalance to Asia, the TPP has been pushed by the Obama administration as key to ensuring strategic U.S. ties to Asia, a framework that will ensure sustainable U.S. engagement in the world’s most populous and economically vibrant region.

However, there is reason to worry that the trade deal may actually lead to increased tensions in the region, and not just between Washington and Beijing. This in turn would complicate rather than strengthen U.S. strategy in the region.

As Important as ‘Another Aircraft Carrier’

To be sure, the fact that the United States has played a leading role in a deal that represents 40 percent of global GDP while China has not was a huge selling point when the White House tried to push through TPA earlier this year. And the administration has not shied away from mobilizing its senior security officials, including Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter, who stated that “passing TPP is as important to me as another aircraft carrier.”

All trade deals, of course, reflect security as well as economic interests between governments, and the TPP is no exception. But stressing the security angle of the trade deal comes in part from the fact that China is not one of the founding members of the deal. Moreover, even as Washington emphasizes the so-called open architecture of TPP, which could allow more nations to join down the line, China among them, it is very evident that the White House views the deal as a way to have the United States play the lead role in setting future trade rules before China does.

The Obama administration believes the TPP would bolster U.S. strategic ties to key Asian allies, including Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and Singapore, while enhancing relations with nations that could counterbalance China’s growing influence in the region by bringing Vietnam and Malaysia into the TPP fold. The belief has been that relations between the 12 TPP member nations would become closer not just economically, but on the security front as well. And it is true, closer economic ties have often led to enhanced military cooperation, as can be seen in the case of Japan and Australia following the signing of their bilateral free trade agreement in April 2014, which came into effect earlier this year. Since then, the two countries have also expanded their military ties, which in turn has enhanced relations for both countries with the United States. Yet the assumption of a positive spillover effect of TPP membership under an umbrella of a common trade agenda may not always hold true.

For instance, the prevailing view in Washington is that South Korea will be one of the first countries to join the TPP once it is ratified, given that a high standard U.S.-Korea free trade agreement (KORUS) came into effect in March 2012. South Korea is undoubtedly a strong candidate to join the group, given that KORUS is seen as a gold standard for free trade deals. Nevertheless, the U.S.-Korea free trade pact largely exempted the politically sensitive Korean rice market. That alone will undoubtedly be a major political issue for all member countries should Korea negotiate entry into the pact, and it will certainly be a source of contention with Japan, a founding member of the TPP that was forced to make concessions on its equally politically sensitive rice market. Any dispute about access to South Korea’s rice market made by Japanese negotiators would certainly hamper relations between Seoul and Tokyo, which are already frosty as the two sides continue to grapple over the politics of historical memory and rising nationalism. Washington may hope that the TPP could help ease the tensions. Instead, negotiations for Korean entry into the bloc could in fact put additional pressure on relations in northeast Asia, at least in the near term.

Another source of tension in the region will undoubtedly be Taiwan’s desire to join the TPP on the one hand, and the international community dealing with the “one China” policy on the other. The Taiwanese government has made clear that it hopes to be one of the first entrants to the TPP, not only to further its position as a global exporter, but also to encourage domestic reform that is critical if Taiwan is to remain competitive. Given its experience in joining the World Trade Organization, whereby it had to wait until China was ready for accession in 2001 so that it could join at the same time, there is growing concern that Taipei would have to wait again for Beijing to be ready. The frustration of being unable to join a group that is seen as key to Taiwan’s growth will undoubtedly strain cross-Strait relations.

The TPP is not the only multilateral trade deal being discussed in Asia. Indeed, if greater regional stability and economic integration is the objective, then there are alternative frameworks. The Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) includes not only all 10 ASEAN countries, but also China, Japan, South Korea, India, Australia, and New Zealand. Critics of the RCEP have been quick to dismiss the pact as aiming at lower standards compared to the TPP, and as focused too heavily on relatively unambitious tariff barrier reductions. Moreover, it is seen as a Chinese-led initiative that does not include the United States. Yet the fact that RCEP brings hitherto unlikely partners such as Burma and Cambodia into the fold of regional trade agreements in itself should be heralded as a significant development that has already achieved what is one of the major longer-term goals of TPP, namely to encourage nations to adopt internationally developed rules and standards. What’s more, the fact that both Japan and South Korea are founding members of RCEP, and are therefore on equal footing, could help thaw tense relations. It may also encourage Tokyo and Seoul to work together to move forward in the China-Japan-Korea trilateral free trade agreement, which has stalled in recent years.

**1ar TPP bad – Asian leadership**

**TPP doesn’t reassure Asian allies, it’s perceived as US meddling which turns their leadership arguments**

Pilling ‘15 – Asia editor of the Financial Times

(David, 4/1/15, Round two in America’s battle for Asian influence, Financial Times, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/fabfd8ac-d6c1-11e4-97c3-00144feab7de.html#axzz3r9DUz7O5)

The exclusion of China serves twin objectives. Neither bears close scrutiny. The TPP is a “trade pivot” to Asia; the commercial equivalent of Washington’s commitment to remain militarily engaged in the region. Yet it is just as likely to annoy allies as reassure them.¶ Almost all have expressed concern that some provisions intrude into their internal affairs. That is, indeed, the point of the TPP, which goes beyond tariff reduction to deal with “behind the border” issues thought to impede trade and investment. These include tendering processes, financial regulations, data protection rules and intellectual property laws. Opponents from Australia to Japan see it not as an act of US benevolence but rather as a charter for meddling in everything from pharmaceutical pricing to cigarette advertising.¶ The other reason for shutting out China is also questionable. The hope is that Beijing, slighted by its exclusion, may be goaded into reforming its economy so it can join at a later stage. Some in Beijing would indeed like to call Washington’s bluff by seeking TPP membership. At least theoretically, China is already moving in a direction that might be conducive to that aim by allowing a greater role for market forces.¶ Yet it is folly to imagine it will be induced to move more quickly to obtain membership of a club to which it has only the most grudging of invitations. More, Beijing is supporting alternative regional trade initiatives, including the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership. Pointedly, that is a club to which the US is not invited.¶ There is a further hitch. If the TPP is seen in much of Asia as designed for the benefit of US corporations, in the US itself it is regarded with equal suspicion. Most members of President Barack Obama’s Democratic party are wary of trade deals, which they blame for hollowing out manufacturing jobs and suppressing middle-class wages. Consumer groups say the TPP will expose Americans to all sorts of evils from dodgy Vietnamese seafood to slack financial regulation.¶ The TPP is nonetheless regarded as one of Mr Obama’s best shots at a foreign policy legacy. If so, he could have sold it better to his own party. He remains uncomfortably reliant on the Republican majority in Congress to grant him the fast-track authority he needs to push it over the line.¶ While most Republicans support a deal in the name of free trade, some on the Tea Party end of the spectrum are opposed. Others may deny Mr Obama the authority he needs out of spite. Ian Bremmer, president of the Eurasia Group consultancy, says the vote on trade promotion authority will be “razor thin”, though he believes ultimately Mr Obama will prevail.¶ Even if TPP is finally concluded, the chances are it will be too watered down to satisfy trade purists and **too intrusive to please Washington’s Pacific partners**. For Beijing, fresh from its triumph over the infrastructure bank, the whole spectacle must be quite amusing.

## Overfishing

### 2ac TPP bad – overfishing

#### Leads to overfishing

Rimmer 5/23/16 – PhD, Professor in Intellectual Property and Innovation Law at the Faculty of Law

(Matthew, “Greenwashing the Trans-Pacific Partnership: Fossil Fuels, the Environment, and Climate Change,” date accessed: 6.24.16, Volume 14 | Issue 2, Santa Clara Journal of International Law, http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1211&context=scujil)//AP

The U.S. Trade Representative has argued that the TPP would provide groundbreaking new tools to protect our oceans.142 The 2011 Green Paper emphasized: “The United States and other TPP countries have proposed TPP disciplines on subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing, potentially lighting the way for a WTO multilateral agreement on fisheries subsidies.”143 The U.S. Trade Representative also hoped to promote regional fisheries management organizations. The Green Paper stresses: “Shark populations in the region are at particular risk, and the United States has proposed specific obligations in this area, such as actions to deter “shark-finning” practices.”144 There has been much debate about whether the TPP has realized such ambitions.

## Environment

### 2ac TPP bad – environment

#### Hurts wildlife

Bale ’15 – reporter for National Geographic's Special Investigations Unit in Washington, DC

(Rachel, 11/5/15, date accessed: 6.25.16, “How the Trans-Pacific Partnership Will—and Won’t—Protect Wildlife,” National Geographic, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2015/11/151105-TPP-free-trade-wildlife-trafficking-conservation-cites/)//AP

The Obama Administration is using these wildlife and environmental provisions as a selling point to try to boost Americans’ support for the agreement. Promoting the deal in May from the Nike headquarters, in Oregon, Obama said:

“It’s got strong, enforceable provisions on the environment, helping us to do things that haven’t been done before, to prevent wildlife trafficking, or deforestation, or dealing with our oceans. And these are enforceable in the agreement.”

But many conservation organizations say the environmental chapter is more like window dressing for a deal that could encourage environmentally destructive pursuits, such as palm oil plantations and more fossil fuel exports. There are also concerns that the language is too weak to provide meaningful protections for animals such as whales and sharks.

“Yes, there is potential for the TPP to strengthen wildlife trade provisions,” said Jacob Phelps, an environmental scientist at Lancaster University in England who studies the effects of free trade on biodiversity. “There’s equally and arguably far greater potential for it to devastate wildlife.”

The wildlife black market funds terror organizations and is itself a form of organized crime. It’s also one of the biggest threats to endangered species. Hundreds of millions of animals and animal parts, from tens of thousands of species, are sold as pets, medicine, food, souvenirs, and spiritual and luxury items each year.

It’s impossible to say exactly how big the illicit market is, but in 2009, Traffic, the wildlife trade monitoring organization, estimated the global value of legal wildlife imports at around $323 billion.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership is well positioned to clamp down on wildlife trafficking. Much of the demand comes from Asian countries. And although China, the world’s biggest consumer of ivory, is not part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, Vietnam and Malaysia are. They’re both hot spots in the battle against wildlife trafficking: Vietnam’s demand for rhino horn is driving rhino poaching, and Malaysia is a major transit country for smuggling everything from elephant ivory to tropical birds to rare reptiles.

“How do you reconcile breaking down the barriers [for legal trade] while increasing the barriers for a small number of [illegal] products?” Phelps said.

It’s going to be tough.

What Will the TPP Do?

Here are some of the things the Trans-Pacific Partnership says countries must do to protect wildlife:

Each country “shall … fulfill its obligations” under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the global treaty that regulates wildlife trade. To protect vulnerable species, CITES signatories are responsible for making sure that the import and export of certain animals are licensed.

Each country “commits to take appropriate measures to protect and conserve” wildlife it has determined is at risk in its territory.

Countries must not weaken their environmental laws to attract investment.

They “shall combat and take measures to prevent” trade in wildlife captured illegally.

They must end some of the most harmful fisheries subsidies. Overfishing is considered a pressing problem facing marine ecosystems and is responsible for the disappearance of 90 percent of the world’s big fish, such as tuna, cod, and swordfish.

Read the full text of the environment chapter here.

One of the most hard-won agreements, according to Jennifer Prescott, an assistant U.S. trade representative who helped negotiate the environment chapter, is the provision that importing countries must combat the trade in any species taken illegally in an origin country, whether the species is protected by law in the destination country or not. If they’re given a credible tip, that is.

This was a new idea for many of the other countries, and it was daunting too, because it’s open-ended. There’s no list defining the species law enforcement must look for.

Let’s say someone imports a bird to Malaysia that was snatched from the wild illegally in Peru. A Peruvian official, or maybe an NGO on the ground, finds out about the poaching and tells Malaysian law enforcement. Under this provision, Malaysia must go after that as a crime, even if the bird isn’t legally protected in Malaysia.

“It took a lot of effort on [other countries’] part to get their head around the idea of taking on an obligation that went beyond their international commitments and involved, in some form or another, recognizing another country’s laws,” said U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman.

Hairsplitting

Because this is a legal document, every single word matters. Splitting hairs makes a difference, which is why many conservation groups and some lawmakers in the U.S. Congress are disappointed that the final text says countries must “take measures to combat” the trade in wildlife taken illegally, rather than requiring them to “prohibit” it.

The latter is legally clear-cut, which means it would be much easier to bring enforcement action against a country that allows the black market to continue.

But how do you decide whether a country is appropriately “combating” wildlife trafficking?

“Words like ‘endeavor’ and ‘take steps to’ are not going to lead to the revolutionary changes we have been told to expect,” said Representative Sandy Levin, a Michigan Democrat, on the U.S. House floor in May.

More disappointing to conservationists is that the agreement doesn’t include the full list of seven multilateral environmental agreements: international treaties that set environmental standards.

In May 2007, a bipartisan agreement in Congress laid out an approach for all future trade agreements, and it supported including these international environmental treaties.

Among them is CITES, which did make it into the Trans-Pacific Partnership and was a priority for U.S. negotiators, since it regulates the international trade in endangered species. The trade agreement gives CITES sharper teeth by linking lack of compliance with the threat of economic penalties.

But missing are international agreements protecting whales, waterfowls’ wetland habitats, fish, and marine animals. Instead of the multilateral environmental agreements themselves, the Trans-Pacific Partnership has stand-alone provisions that address these topics.

For example, instead of requiring countries to abide by the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, which put a moratorium on commercial whaling, the agreement says countries “shall promote the long-term conservation of sharks, marine turtles, seabirds, and marine mammals.”

This phrasing is weak and too vague to be enforceable, critics say. But the U.S. trade representative sees it as potentially stronger than the whaling convention, because it’s open-ended: Unlike the whaling convention, it applies to all marine mammals, including dolphins. Plus it doesn’t have a “scientific use” exemption, which Japan has used to continue whaling, despite the International Court of Justice’s finding that it was abusing the exemption.

It goes on to say that measures “should include, as appropriate,” shark finning bans and “relevant management procedures” for sea turtles, seabirds, and marine mammals.

Enforcing the Provisions

Theoretically, a country that allows the illegal wildlife trade to proliferate, in violation of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, could be hit with sanctions.

But how likely is that?

Take the example of Peru. In 2009, the U.S. and Peru entered into a trade agreement that was groundbreakingly detailed in its environmental provisions. The language is clear and strong, especially against illegal logging and timber trafficking, and conservationists hold it up as a model trade deal.

Such language should make enforcement easier. But six years after the deal went into effect, Peru has not clamped down on illegal logging.

And whereas the U.S. has been working closely with Peru to combat illegal logging, it has not taken any actions against the country under the trade agreement.

Formal dispute settlement under a trade agreement is always a last resort, said Assistant U.S. Trade Representative Prescott, since the process can close the door on cooperation. If cooperation is producing results, that’s always the preferred route.

It’s not just Peru. A 2009 report from the U.S. Government Accountability Office found that many free-trade partner countries were having trouble upholding obligations under trade agreements—and that the U.S. didn’t have the capacity to monitor or enforce the provisions.

Five years later, the Government Accountability Office noted that the U.S. had made progress but was still struggling to monitor environmental commitments.

Unlike past treaties, which have involved the U.S. and one other country, this time the U.S. isn’t the only enforcement monitor.

"Everyone expects that we’ll be more focused and more aggressive than everybody else,” said Froman. “But a lot of other countries care about this issue as well, and TPP gives them the opportunity to use the enforcement mechanisms also."

Dispute Settlement Between Countries

The final language of the environment chapter’s dispute resolution process is seen as a win for conservationists, unlike a previous, highly criticized draft released by WikiLeaks at the beginning of 2014. In that version, countries were merely required, essentially, to talk it out, with no plan for recourse if they didn’t reach an agreement.

The final document says that if one country believes another isn’t upholding its environmental responsibilities, the dispute will be subject to the same resolution process—and threat of economic penalties—as the rest of the commercial clauses in the trade deal.

Suppose there was evidence that Vietnam’s police regularly look the other way when shopkeepers sell rhino horn. The U.S., or any other country, could file a complaint. An internal panel would hear the dispute and make a decision. If the complaining country were to win, it could impose penalties, such as trade sanctions (the most severe measure).

Still, conservationists are skeptical given what they see as the U.S.’s weak record on taking formal actions against trade partners for environmental violations.

“It’s unlikely we’d ever see trade sanctions imposed on a country for not living up to its wildlife protection obligations,” said Ilana Solomon, of the Sierra Club, one of the loudest critics of the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

And even if the U.S. did decide to bring a complaint, the language in the deal is, in many cases, weak enough that the accused country wouldn’t have too much trouble fighting it off, she said.

Corporate Lawsuits

The Trans-Pacific Partnership allows corporations to challenge government policies, including environmental ones, that they believe discriminate against them and harm their investment. Through a mechanism called investor-state dispute settlement, a corporation can sue a government to bring its complaint to an arbitration tribunal.

Investor-state dispute settlement first came to prominence in multilateral treaties when it was introduced as part of NAFTA. Its record has been controversial.

Even the threat of a suit can cause countries to reconsider passing environmental protections, said Rachel Wellhausen, who studies these legal challenges at the University of Texas at Austin.

Corporations win about one-third of the suits they bring before arbitration tribunals, and another one-third are settled, according to Wellhausen. It can be difficult to tease out which suits were over environmental issues, she said, but the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, a left-leaning think tank, tried to do just that for suits brought under NAFTA.

It found that more than 60 percent of the suits filed against Canada under NAFTA’s investor-state dispute chapter were related to environmental or resource management policies. In the U.S., that number was closer to 30 percent.

The United States, however, has never lost such a suit against an investor corporation.

“If you look at the cases that have been decided on their merits, they have upheld environmental rules,” said Michael Smart, a vice president at Rock Creek Global Advisors, an international economic policy advisory firm. Smart pointed to the case of Chemtura, a U.S. chemical company that challenged Canada’s ban on a particular pesticide. Chemtura’s case was dismissed, and it was ordered to pay the costs of arbitration.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership has new language that will allow frivolous suits to be dismissed earlier in the process, and it includes standard free-trade agreement preamble language that the deal recognizes each country has the right to adopt or enforce regulatory measures to protect the environment (among other things).

But this boilerplate language is often seen as more diplomatic than legal, especially given the fact that suits over environmental policies have been brought in the past. While the Trans-Pacific Partnership’s investor-state dispute settlement chapter has a specific carve-out to prevent suits over tobacco regulations, no such extra protection exists for environmental regulations, despite calls for that from Senate Democrats.

### 1ar TPP bad AT: solves environment

#### Parties won’t agree to environmental provisions

Vincent ’14 – J.D., University of San Diego School of Law, 2012; B.A., University of California, San Diego, 2009

(David P., page 23-24, “The Trans-Pacific Partnership: Environmental Savior or Regulatory Carte Blanche?” date accessed: Fri Jun 24 16:45:11 2016, MINNESOTA JOURNAL OF INT'L LAW, Volume 23)//AP

There is, however, cause for concern that the TPP will not adequately protect environmental interests. It is not an easy task getting eleven or more countries to agree on any type of international law, but environmental provisions are an especially difficult topic. Accordingly, the environmental chapter has emerged as one of the most challenging areas of the negotiations. 6 7 Developing nations are the most concerned with including environmental provisions, as they would be at a disadvantage if they must adhere to the same standards as developed nations.'68 Enforcement is also a major issue as several parties do not want to make environmental obligations binding under the TPP dispute settlement mechanism as the United States has proposed. 169 Even though New Zealand has proposed including climate change provisions in the TPP, its support has been limited to a non-binding affirmation of the benefit of pricing carbon. 70 It remains uncertain how hard the United States will push for strict environmental provisions where it may conflict with its other interests regarding drafting of the TPP.

### 1ar TPP bad AT: solves climate

#### Can’t solve climate – no country wants regulations

Rimmer 5/23/16 – PhD, Professor in Intellectual Property and Innovation Law at the Faculty of Law

(Matthew, “Greenwashing the Trans-Pacific Partnership: Fossil Fuels, the Environment, and Climate Change,” date accessed: 6.24.16, Volume 14 | Issue 2, Santa Clara Journal of International Law, http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1211&context=scujil)//AP

The New Zealand proposal has not necessarily found favour with environmental groups. There has been criticism that the text is a “shadow solution”—to the use the language of Stephen Gardiner—because it only addresses the problem of climate change in a limited way.286 There has been concern that text on climate change in the TPP may undermine or erode the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change 1992, the Kyoto Protocol 1997, and ongoing multilateral negotiations over climate change. As revealed by the draft text, Peru has also proposed text on climate change in the TPP, reflecting its policy to reduce carbon emissions. However, as highlighted by the WikiLeaks text, the U.S. and Australia opposed the inclusion of the drafted text on climate change. President Barack Obama is a paradox. While he supports domestic action on climate change, Obama has shown a great unwillingness to push for substantive obligations on climate change at an international level in the TPP. Australia’s position against the text on climate change will no doubt harden. It is not clear where Australia stands in the debate over the TPP and climate change— especially in light of its package of reforms designed to promote a Clean Energy Future.287 As Prime Minister, then Coalition leader Tony Abbott repealed carbon pricing laws and sought to dismantle the clean energy future reforms passed previously by the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Greens. The new Coalition leader and Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull has yet to fully declare his position in respect of climate change. Under Stephen Harper, the Conservative Government in Canada was supportive of fossil fuels—particularly the exploitation of tar-sands in Alberta. The Conservative Government was hostile to environmental regulation and climate action.288 Stephen Harper was willing to support the TPP, even though his government was in a caretaker election mode. The NDP’s Thomas Mulcair insisted that he would not be bound by Harper’s secret deal.289 Canadian Greens MP Elizabeth May was highly critical of the environmental impact of the TPP.290 Naomi Klein and Maude Barlow warned: “At international climate negotiations, our government’s defiant commitment to carbon pollution will continue to be a barrier to progress, giving other governments an excuse to lower their ambitions and waste what is left of this critical decade.”291 Stephen Harper went to the Canadian election, promising to pass the TPP, before Canadian voters had an opportunity to see the texts of the agreement. Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party of Canada soundly won the election in 2015 and vowed that there would be an open discussion of the TPP.292 This new government promises to show a greater respect for environmental regulation and climate action.293 Trudeau has remained uncommitted on the question of implementing the TPP. Moreover, Vietnam, Peru, and Malaysia did not want a reference to fossil fuel subsidies in an Article in the Environment Chapter of the TPP. The nations opposed this text: “The Parties recognize their respective commitments in APEC to rationalize and phase out over the medium term inefficient fossil fuel subsidies that encourage wasteful consumption, while recognizing the importance of providing those in need with essential energy services.”294 Heather Smith observed that, in the new Pacific trade talks leak, “climate” became an unmentioned topic.295 She commented that the U.S. was not playing a constructive role in the debate over climate change: The previous draft had a vague agreement to “acknowledge climate change as a global concern that requires collective action, and recognize the importance of implementation of their respective commitments under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCC).” Under the proposed U.S. revision, the parties instead “affirm the importance of moving towards low- emissions economies.” That’s it. No mention of what a low-emissions economy might be. No mention of the UNFCC, whose agreements are non-binding and largely ineffectual but still represent the closest thing the world has to a global climate change policy. The U.S.’s proposed revisions scrub the words “climate change” from the text of the chapter.296 Heather Smith suggested that the leak revealed the priorities of U.S. trade representatives: “The American trade delegation is reverting to old-school denial— as if, as long as we don’t mention it, maybe the problem will just go away.”297

## Biodiversity

### 2ac TPP bad – biodiversity

#### Tanks biodiversity

Rimmer 5/23/16 – PhD, Professor in Intellectual Property and Innovation Law at the Faculty of Law

(Matthew, “Greenwashing the Trans-Pacific Partnership: Fossil Fuels, the Environment, and Climate Change,” date accessed: 6.24.16, Volume 14 | Issue 2, Santa Clara Journal of International Law, http://digitalcommons.law.scu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1211&context=scujil)//AP

There has been concern about the efficacy of the multilateral framework for the protection of biodiversity. The Pacific Rim features a rich and diverse environment, with ecosystems such as the Great Barrier Reef,106 The Amazon, and a third of all the threatened species on earth. The U.S. Trade Representative, Michael Froman, has argued that the TPP would address conservation challenges, which were particularly prevalent in the Asia- Pacific region: Our TPP partners include many “biodiversity hotspots” some of which have served as conduits for illegal trade and smuggling in threatened animal, timber, plant and marine species. This makes TPP a unique opportunity to improve regional cooperation and enforcement of the rules of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), from the islands of Southeast Asia to the interior of Vietnam, from the forests of Chile and Peru to the plains of Australia. Whether protecting big-leaf mahogany or tigers, sharks and chinchillas, stronger legal frameworks, more cooperation, and better enforcement will improve the chances that these species survive.107 Froman has maintained: “Similarly, the broader U.S. proposals on conservation, also detailed in our Green Paper, would elevate other TPP countries’ commitments toward our own congressionally-set standards on issues such as the conservation of wildlife, forests, and protected areas.”108 In 2012, members of the U.S. Congress—including Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR), Olympia Snowe (R-ME), John Kerry (D-MA)—emphasized the need for biodiversity protection and environmental conservation: An agreement that is good for American businesses, good for the environment, creates jobs, and keeps the playing field across the Pacific region can only be achieved by strengthened the legal and sustainable trade of natural resources and combating trade in illegal timber, fish, and wildlife. Without such provisions, the rich biodiversity of the Pacific Rim and the legitimate businesses and good jobs it sustains will continue to be threatened, ultimately undermining legal trade and the U.S. economy.109 Draft Article SS.13 of the Environment Chapter of the TPP addresses the topic of trade and biodiversity.110 The language echoes some of the key principles in the Convention on Biological Diversity 1992,111 the Bonn Guidelines 2002,112 and the Nagoya Protocol 2010.113 Draft Article SS.13.1 of the TPP recognises the “importance of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and their key role in achieving sustainable development.”114 The text promotes access to genetic resources, benefit-sharing, and the protection of Indigenous Knowledge. Draft Article SS.13.2 provides that “the Parties are committed to promoting and encouraging the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and sharing in a fair and equitable way the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources.”115 Draft Article SS.13.3 emphasizes that “the Parties reiterate their commitment to, subject to national legislation, respecting, preserving and maintaining the knowledge, innovations, and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, and encourage the equitable sharing of the benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices.”116 Draft Article SS.13.4 emphasizes that “the Parties recognize the sovereign rights of States over their natural resources, and that the authority to determine access to genetic resources rests with the national governments and is subject to national legislation.”117 Draft Article SS.13.5 stresses: “The Parties recognize that, subject to national legislation, access to genetic resources for their utilization, where granted, should be subject to the prior informed consent of the Party providing such resources, unless otherwise determined by that Party.”118 The provision maintains that “the Parties further recognize that benefits arising from the utilization of these genetic resources should be shared in a fair and equitable way.” It stresses that “such sharing should be upon mutually agreed terms.”119 Draft Article SS.13.6 comments that “the Parties also recognize the importance of public participation and consultations, as provided for by domestic law or policy, on matters concerning the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”120 It suggests: “Each Party should make publicly available information about its programs and activities, including cooperative programs, related to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”121 Draft Article SS.13.7 promotes cooperative activity “in areas of mutual interest related to biological diversity.”122 Cooperation includes “the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity” as well as “the protection and maintenance of ecosystem and ecosystem services” and “the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources, including by appropriate access to genetic resources.”123 As revealed by the draft texts, the U.S. has provided opposition to this language on the basis that it was not a member of the Convention on Biological Diversity 1992. As such, the TPP will do little to protect the magnificent biodiversity of the Pacific Rim. Neither the draft texts nor the final texts of the TPP adequately address the international environmental framework in respect of the conservation of biodiversity. On the topic of biodiversity, Professor Jane Kelsey from the University of Auckland was critical of the failure of the Environment Chapter of the TPP to properly address Indigenous rights.124 She commented: “Prior consent to accessing genetic resources and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits in paragraph 5 relates to the state, not to indigenous peoples or local communities.”125 Such an approach is less than what is required under the Convention on Biological Diversity 1992, the Bonn Guidelines 2001, and the Nagoya Protocol 2010. Moreover, Kelsey observed: “This falls far short of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 2007.”126 The problem was further compounded by the final version of the Intellectual Property Chapter of the TPP.127 There has long been a close interaction between intellectual property, access to genetic resources, and Indigenous intellectual property.128 The final text of the TPP has only soft language about cooperation by nation states in respect of the protection of traditional knowledge. Little wonder Maori groups and communities are challenging the validity and legitimacy of the TPP under the Treaty of Waitangi 1840.129 In a letter to the U.S. Trade Representative in July 2015, a group of 19 Democrats in the House of Representatives—led by Earl Blumenauer—expressed concerns about the Environment Chapter of the TPP.130 The group highlighted that the “TPP countries represent some of the most resource-rich regions in the world.”131 The House Democrats warned: From Vietnam’s Mekong Delta to the Peruvian Amazon to Chile’s Patagonia wilderness to the rich Pacific Ocean that ties all TPP countries together, we cannot forego an opportunity to improve environmental protections, enforce conservation standards, and prohibit the illegal trade in wildlife, forest, and living marine resources to a degree that no level of foreign aid could accomplish.132 The final text of the TPP does contain language on trade and biodiversity in Article 20.13, but it is minimalist text, which has been cut down from the earlier drafts.133 Article 20.13.1 provides: “The Parties recognise the importance of conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and their key role in achieving sustainable development.”134 Article 20.13.2 states: “Accordingly, each Party shall promote and encourage the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, in accordance with its law or policy.”135 Article 20.13.3 provides: “The Parties recognise the importance of respecting, preserving and maintaining knowledge and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles that contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”136 It is noticeable here that there is some small reference to Indigenous rights in respect of access to genetic resources. Article 20.13.4 notes: “The Parties recognise the importance of facilitating access to genetic resources within their respective national jurisdictions, consistent with each Party’s international obligations.”137 Moreover, the Parties also recognize that some Parties “require, through national measures, prior informed consent to access such genetic resources in accordance with national measures and, where such access is granted, the establishment of mutually agreed terms, including with respect to sharing of benefits from the use of such genetic resources, between users and providers.”138 Article 20.13.5 provides: “The Parties also recognise the importance of public participation and consultation, in accordance with their respective law or policy, in the development and implementation of measures concerning the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”139 Article 20.13.5 also stresses: “Each Party shall make publicly available information about its programmes and activities, including cooperative programmes, related to the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity.”140 Article 20.13.6 observes that “the Parties shall cooperate to address matters of mutual interest,” including “the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity” and “the protection and maintenance of ecosystems and ecosystem services” as well as “access to genetic resources and the sharing of benefits arising from their utilization.”141 In my view, the TPP fails to promote the conservation of biodiversity in the Pacific Rim, and that should be a reason and cause for regret. There was a missed opportunity to provide a substantive regime in respect of the protection of biodiversity.

## Kritik

### 2ac TPP bad – kritiks

#### Marginalizes poor countries – only benefits elites

Stiglitz ’14 – American economist and a professor at Columbia University

(Joseph E., 3/15/14, “On the Wrong Side of Globalization,” NYT, date accessed: 6.24.116, <http://www.relooney.com/NS3040/000_New_929.pdf>)//AP

There are other noxious provisions. America has been fighting to lower the cost of health care. But the TPP would make the introduction of generic drugs more difficult, and thus raise the price of medicines. In the poorest countries, this is not just about moving money into corporate coffers: thousands would die unnecessarily. Of course, those who do research have to be compensated. That’s why we have a patent system. But the patent system is supposed to carefully balance the benefits of intellectual protection with another worthy goal: making access to knowledge more available. I’ve written before about how the system has been abused by those seeking patents for the genes that predispose women to breast cancer. The Supreme Court ended up rejecting those patents, but not before many women suffered unnecessarily. Trade agreements provide even more opportunities for patent abuse. The worries mount. One way of reading the leaked negotiation documents suggests that the TPP would make it easier for American banks to sell risky derivatives around the world, perhaps setting us up for the same kind of crisis that led to the Great Recession. In spite of all this, there are those who passionately support the TPP and agreements like it, including many economists. What makes this support possible is bogus, debunked economic theory, which has remained in circulation mostly because it serves the interests of the wealthiest. Free trade was a central tenet of economics in the discipline’s early years. Yes, there are winners and losers, the theory went, but the winners can always compensate the losers, so that free trade (or even freer trade) is a win-win. This conclusion, unfortunately, is based on numerous assumptions, many of which are simply wrong. The older theories, for instance, simply ignored risk, and assumed that workers could move seamlessly between jobs. It was assumed that the economy was at full employment, so that workers displaced by globalization would quickly move from low-productivity sectors (which had thrived simply because foreign competition was kept at bay through tariffs and other trade restrictions) to high productivity sectors. But when there is a high level of unemployment, and especially when a large percentage of the unemployed have been out of work long term (as is the case now), there can’t be such complacency. Today, there are 20 million Americans who would like a full-time job but can’t get one. Millions have stopped looking. So there is a real risk that individuals moved from low productivity-employment in a protected sector will end up zeroproductivity members of the vast ranks of the unemployed. This hurts even those who keep their jobs, as higher unemployment puts downward pressure on wages. We can argue over why our economy isn’t performing the way it’s supposed to — whether it’s because of a lack of aggregate demand, or because our banks, more interested in speculation and market manipulation than lending, are not providing adequate funds to small and medium-size enterprises. But whatever the reasons, the reality is that these trade agreements do risk increasing unemployment. One of the reasons that we are in such bad shape is that we have mismanaged globalization. Our economic policies encourage the outsourcing of jobs: Goods produced abroad with cheap labor can be cheaply brought back into the United States. So American workers understand that they have to compete with those abroad, and their bargaining power is weakened. This is one of the reasons that the real median income of full-time male workers is lower than it was 40 years ago.

## Economy

### 2ac TPP bad – economy

#### Worse for the economy

Stiglitz ’14 – American economist and a professor at Columbia University

(Joseph E., 3/15/14, “On the Wrong Side of Globalization,” NYT, date accessed: 6.24.116, <http://www.relooney.com/NS3040/000_New_929.pdf>)//AP

American politics today compounds these problems. Even in the best of circumstances, the old free trade theory said only that the winners could compensate the losers, not that they would. And they haven’t — quite the opposite. Advocates of trade agreements often say that for America to be competitive, not only will wages have to be cut, but so will taxes and expenditures, especially on programs that are of benefit to ordinary citizens. We should accept the short-term pain, they say, because in the long run, all will benefit. But as John Maynard Keynes famously said in another context, “in the long run we are all dead.” In this case, there is little evidence that the trade agreements will lead to faster or more profound growth. Critics of the TPP are so numerous because both the process and the theory that undergird it are bankrupt. Opposition has blossomed not just in the United States, but also in Asia, where the talks have stalled. By leading a full-on rejection of fast-track authority for the TPP, the Senate majority leader, Harry Reid, seems to have given us all a little respite. Those who see trade agreements as enriching corporations at the expense of the 99 percent seem to have won this skirmish. But there is a broader war to ensure that trade policy — and globalization more generally — is designed so as to increase the standards of living of most Americans. The outcome of that war remains uncertain. In this series, I have repeatedly made two points: The first is that the high level of inequality in the United States today, and its enormous increase during the past 30 years, is the cumulative result of an array of policies, programs and laws. Given that the president himself has emphasized that inequality should be the country’s top priority, every new policy, program or law should be examined from the perspective of its impact on inequality. Agreements like the TPP have contributed in important ways to this inequality. Corporations may profit, and it is even possible, though far from assured, that gross domestic product as conventionally measured will increase. But the well-being of ordinary citizens is likely to take a hit. And this brings me to the second point that I have repeatedly emphasized: Trickle-down economics is a myth. Enriching corporations — as the TPP would — will not necessarily help those in the middle, let alone those at the bottom.

**US-China Relations**

**2ac TPP bad – China relations**

**TPP accelerates US-China economic rivalry—destroys overall relations and cooperation**

* Outweighs military containment

Goldstein ‘15 – associate professor in the China Maritime Studies Institute @ U.S. Naval War College

Lyle J., *Meeting China Halfway: How to Defuse the Emerging US-China Rivalry*, Georgetown University Press, pg. 99-100

The TPP has unwittingly taken **center stage** in the geopolitical, and indeed geo-economic, rivalry now unfolding between Beijing and Washington. The reasons for this are threefold: First, Washington has been anxious to show that the rebalancing is not primarily a military initiative, and therefore has empha-sized the TPP as the leading edge of its "pivot" to the Asia-Pacific. Second, the TPP accomplishes a highly symbolic union within American domestic politics among economic nationalists, human rights advocates, and environmental-ists, together with geopolitical hawks, who can unite around a view of China's challenge as unfair, unjust, and dangerous all at the same time. A final perti-nent reason to consider the TPP is that discussion of this trade bloc as part of the US rebalancing strategy has had a very deep and negative impact on the view of US-China relations as seen from Beijing. This is because, though American military deployments to places such as Australia and Singapore do register some concern, such moves are generally regarded as symbolic and without great impact on the bilateral relationship. However, **the TPP is viewed as a potentially grave threat to Chinese economic development**, insofar as that development has been largely premised to date on radically dynamic trad-ing relationships. In other words, the **TPP is a cudgel that may strike China where it truly hurts**. Advocates of a zero-sum rivalry and all that it entails may delight at an instrument that makes bureaucrats in Beijing truly nervous, but **those favoring a cooperative bilateral future will see major dangers lurking in this growing economic rivalry**. The literature cited above shows that at least some Chinese thinkers are open to adopting a positive approach to the TPP— viewing the institution quite akin to the WTO breakthrough that began in the late 1990s—as an opportunity to further drive reforms within China. If Washington could take steps to show that it might see the TPP in a similar light, that might enable a process of further dynamic economic cooperation to unfold between the United States and China.

**US China co-op accesses every impact and solves extinction**

Watkins, 8-21-’15 -- advisor to the University of Michigan Confucius Institute, Michigan’s Economic Development Corporation and Detroit Chinese Business Association

(Tom, U.S./China: The Most Important Bilateral Relationship in the World Today, China US Focus, http://www.chinausfocus.com/foreign-policy/u-s-china-the-most-important-bilateral-relationship-in-the-world-today/)

**Our U.S.-China relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world today**. All major global issues intersect at the corner of Beijing and Washington, D.C., and **there is much for the two world leaders to discuss** – **conversations best done on a foundation of** mutual respect, seeking **win-win strategies that enhance world peace** and economic growth.¶ **A few topics worthy of time and effort include**: **climate change**, **Iran’s nuclear program**, **cyber-spying**, **the South China Sea**, the Chinese economic bubble, an expanding Chinese military, Chinese currency policy, **global terrorism**, **global economic growth**, **environmental protection**, efforts to combat **the Islamic State**, the situation in **Ukraine**, China’s global reach in **Africa**, **the Caribbean** and **South America**—**to name a few**.¶ Perhaps even a mention about human rights and Tibet will be broached—just enough to appease America’s human rights activists. As China’s power has expanded, the U.S. has tipped-toed around these sensitive topics. Human rights activists claim that since President Xi came to power, China’s human rights record has worsened. China considers “human rights” an internal affair issue and rejects any outside interference.¶ This is President Xi’s first official State visit to Washington as China’s leader at a time when the Chinese economy is experiencing a ‘correction’ causing significant domestic anxiety. **With China’s importance to the world’s economy, what happens in China no longer stays in China**. Global economic markets fear any major setback to China’s gravy train.¶ Few expect major agreements or breakthroughs during the visit. Xi’s trip is expected to be a largely photo-op for domestic Chinese consumption, and will be used to strengthen connections in order to avoid conflicts. Many China watchers believe the visit is an attempt by both nations to take stock of their relationship and patch over any rough spots during Obama’s remaining time in office.¶ Yet there is some momentum in this fluid relationship. Last autumn, Obama and Xi struck a major climate deal to reduce carbon admissions which environmentalist heralded as an important step towards a larger global climate deal that could be reached before year’s end.¶ Hope For Major Breakthroughs¶ While there are many hurdles ahead, there is hope the two governments might break ground on military confidence agreements that were announced last November, especially agreeing on standards of behavior for unexpected encounters between U.S. and Chinese naval vessels and planes as tension continues to build in the South China Sea.¶ Even more ambitious would be a breakthrough on negotiating a bilateral investment treaty (BIT). U.S. negotiators and their Chinese counterparts are currently exchanging the all-important “exclusion lists” which critical industries are tapped to remain off-limits to foreign investors. This is crucial as China has trillions to invest around the globe and is seeking safe harbors for such investments. Experts believe progress toward an agreement on this treaty would be a major step forward in trade between our countries and a domestic boost for both presidents.¶ Michigan’s Governor, Rick Snyder, is in China this month on his fifth trip in as many years. His focus on building bridges with China has paid dividends by creating jobs though Chinese investment in Michigan. We all have a stake in keeping that investment momentum moving forward.¶ Who Benefits-Xi? Obama? Or All Humanity?¶ President Obama clearly would like to have a major foreign policy win as his final term runs out even as President Xi, with seven years left in office, has time on his side. Obama will play the gracious host seeking agreements that can help shore up his foreign policy legacy as his lame duck status clock ticks. The Obama administration wants to showcase the progress they have made on strengthening U.S.-China relations at a time when **the tectonic plates of power are shifting between our countries**.¶ As the 21st century unfolds, the competition and cooperation with China on multiple levels will ebb and flow. However, **we must reject the hawks’ view** – from both sides of the Pacific – **that confrontation is inevitable**.¶ Since its opening to the world and normalization of relations has taken hold, **our engagement with China has served America well. It has also served China well**. **The upcoming dialogue between our leaders will impact the citizens of America, China, and all humanity**. **Let’s hope they get it right**.

**1ar TPP bad – China relations**

**Spills over to destroy coop on other issues**

Yu 10/19 -- professor of law and co-director of the Center for Law and Intellectual Property at Texas A&M University

(Peter K, How China's exclusion from the TPP could hurt its economic growth, Fortune, http://fortune.com/2015/10/19/china-exclusion-tpp-economic-growth/)

Third, in view of the TPP, China may reassess its cooperation with the U.S. For those embracing a growing G-2 partnership between the two countries, **the TPP could provide a major setback** to U.S.-China cooperation in areas such as **climate change**, nuclear **nonproliferation** and **cybersecurity**. China may also develop a closer relationship with the E.U., considering that the latter was equally left out of the regional pact.

**TPP fuels US-China antagonism—undermines cooperation despite mutual interests which overwhelms resiliency**

**Zhou 11-6**

Steven, Reporter, Al Jazeera American, “The TPP risks making US-China relations worse,” http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2015/11/the-tpp-risks-making-us-china-relations-worse.html

The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), finalized last month by 12 Pacific Rim nations, including the United States, will be the largest trade pact in modern history. It will rewrite the rules that affect how about 40 percent of the global economy does business, with the intent of increasing trade and investment. The White House released the agreement’s text to the public yesterday.¶ Much discussion regarding the TPP has focused on the absence from the pact of China, the largest economy in the Asia-Pacific region. President Barack Obama has portrayed the exclusion as an attempt by the U.S. and its allies to “write the rules” in the region before China does. But this kind of antagonism does nothing to push U.S.-China relations — perhaps the most important bilateral relationship in the world — toward anything productive. The increasing anti-China rhetoric that has accompanied the Obama administration’s Asian pivot will result in fewer opportunities to partner on major global initiatives and hurt both nations economically.¶ While the U.S. and China have cooperated on a number of important issues, including a notable recent agreement on climate change, geopolitical tensions persist. President Xi Jinping, who has led China since 2012, has pushed for a new brand of nationalism that emphasizes the projection of Chinese power in Asia. This has gotten China into territorial disputes with its neighbors, which in turn have looked to the U.S. for help. China’s periodic alignment with Syria, Iran and Russia has set it at odds with the Obama administration’s strategy in the Middle East. Finally, Washington has serious concerns about Chinese cyberattacks on U.S. businesses.¶ Given all this, China’s ruling Communist Party has been very nervous about the TPP from the beginning. The Obama administration is selling the TPP to Congress and to the United States’ international partners as an opportunity to get a jump on China in writing global trade rules. The TPP includes China’s neighbors and major trading partners such as Japan and Australia, and the Chinese leadership is worried about losing regional influence.¶ On the other hand, moderate voices in China such as Long Yongtu, who negotiated China’s entry into the World Trade Organization, have viewed the TPP as a possible way to encourage the Chinese leadership to carry out systemic reforms. For instance, the TPP contains clauses regarding the environment that could influence Chinese policies in a progressive manner. He even argued in 2014 that the TPP would have to include China “sooner or later.” But the Obama administration’s domestic considerations have eclipsed this possibility, as it uses China as a foil to persuade Democrats and Republicans to accept the accord.¶ The U.S. has portrayed and marketed the TPP as a way to position itself independently of China in the geopolitics of Asia. This kind of rhetoric has helped push China to pursue a similar path of independent development, irrespective of U.S. concerns. Instead of accepting U.S. containment, China has looked to expand its power and influence.¶ China has ongoing territorial disputes in the South China Sea with Indonesia, Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines and Vietnam. These countries allege that China is infringing on their maritime sovereignty. China is also locking horns with Japan over islands that both countries claim as theirs.¶ Meanwhile, China has found other ways to throw its weight around in Asia. It has made huge investments into trade projects such as the Silk Road Economic Belt, along with closely related networks like the China-Pakistan Economic Corridor. It has established the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, which now has more than 50 signatories, including the United Kingdom, against U.S. wishes.¶ The saddest aspect of the widening U.S.-China gap is that the TPP’s specific clauses aren’t necessarily aimed at antagonizing or containing China. The country remains one of America’s biggest trading partners and is the biggest trading partner of Vietnam, Japan, New Zealand and Australia, all signatories of the TPP. It would have benefited the U.S. and China if the two countries could have come together to write the international rules on trade. That **ship has likely sailed**, unless China’s recent economic struggles can direct its leadership to join the TPP or at least form a strategic partnership with the bloc.¶ Each participating country has to ratify the TPP agreement, and the accord faces serious opposition in the U.S. from both Democrats and Republicans, for different reasons. Some Democrats have questioned whether the deal is good for U.S. labor, while senior Republicans have voiced their disagreement over rules affecting the pharmaceutical industry. The U.S. debate takes place against the backdrop of a presidential campaign, and Democratic front-runner Hillary Clinton has begun to change her tune on the TPP in a bid for the support of organized labor, despite advocating for it as Obama’s secretary of state.¶ It has likely become too late to change China’s fundamental orientation in the region. Beijing is now trying to push through its own multilateral trade agreement, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership. This proposal is widely seen as China’s version of the TPP and involves 10 member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Like the TPP, it will affect about 40 percent of the global economy. **If the U.S. and China continue to use trade as a weapon against each other’s influence, both countries will suffer, along with the rest of Asia – and the world.**

**TPP escalates US-China hostility**

**Carpenter 10/10**

Ted Galen, The Trans-Pacific Partnership: Washington’s Unwise Exclusion of China, CATO Institute, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/trans-pacific-partnership-washingtons-unwise-exclusion-china

Using the TPP as an instrument of a containment policy is extremely unwise. The importance of the bilateral trade relationship should cause US officials to exercise greater caution. So, too, should the fact that China holds some $1.3 trillion of US Treasury debt and is now the single largest foreign purchaser of such debt. It is generally not a good idea for individuals to antagonize their banker, and a similar principle applies to the behavior of nations.¶ China’s own conduct is causing understandable concern, though. Beijing’s breathtakingly broad territorial claims in the South China Sea (encompassing nearly 90% of that body of water) and its increasingly aggressive pursuit of those claims has especially provoked neighboring countries and encouraged hawks in the United States to advocate a confrontational stance. China’s assertiveness in the South China Sea, along with Beijing’s challenge to Japan regarding the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands, is consistent with the behavior of a rising power that is determined to exercise greater influence in its immediate neighborhood. And Beijing can back up those ambitions with growing economic and military capabilities. The recent slowdown in China’s economy may alter the pace of that assertiveness, but it does not change the fundamental reality that China is a rising power with ambitions to match.¶ That development poses a difficult test for US foreign policy. The historical record of relations between rising great powers and incumbent hegemons is not reassuring. Too often, the result has been intense hostility and even outright warfare. The inability of Great Britain and France to accommodate the rise of Imperial Germany in the early twentieth century is a cautionary tale of the potential for disaster if such a relationship is mishandled. Accommodating a rising China without allowing that country to run roughshod and become the unchallenged hegemon of East Asia is the task now facing US policymakers. It is not an easy task, but American officials need to be more flexible and conciliatory than they have been to this point. A good first step would be to commence immediate negotiations to bring China into the TPP instead of using that agreement as merely the latest component of a hostile containment policy.

## Growth

### 2ac TPP bad – growth

**TPP kills growth – their models are wrong**

**Capaldo and Izurieta 16**

Jeronim Capaldo is a Research Fellow with GDAE's Globalization and Sustainable Development Program. Previously he was Senior Researcher at GDAE and a member of the modeling and forecasting team at United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, where he was responsible for Latin America and the Caribbean and for the analysis of global employment. Prior to this, at the Food and Agriculture Organization, he analyzed the economic effects of climate change in Africa and Central America. Jeronim earned a Laurea cum laude in economics from the University of Rome “La Sapienza” and is currently a PhD candidate in economics at the New School for Social Research. His current research focuses on global macroeconomic models applied to trade and fiscal policy. Alex Izurieta is a Senior Economic Affairs Officer in the Division on Globalization and Development Strategies (GDS) of UNCTAD, previously at UN/DESA, New York. His area of expertise is the analysis of global economic developments and the evaluation of policy scenarios with the help of macro-economic and global models. Prior to joining the UN system, he worked as a Senior Researcher at the University of Cambridge, UK, as a Research Scholar at the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, New York, and as a Researcher at the International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University in The Hague. He has published in those institutions and in various international journals. Trading Down: Unemployment, Inequality and Other Risks of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTE WORKING PAPER NO. 16-01, January 2016, http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/wp/16-01Capaldo-IzurietaTPP.pdf, msm

According to its proponents, the TPP will generate higher economic growth throughout the area by eliminating tariffs and other obstacles to international trade and investment. With its coverage of a large share of the world economy, potential implications for several policy areas and a fairly large membership, the TPP bears a close resemblance with the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) discussed by the European Union and the United States. As with its trans-Atlantic homologue, much political emphasis has been placed on the TPP’s prospective economic effects. Several analyses have highlighted potential advantages and risks of the TPP for trade flows, industrial output, wages, international investment and financial stability. Calculating the net effects of these factors on economic growth, employment and income distribution requires making assumptions about how economies adjust to external shocks. Different theories exist to explain these processes. The standard model assumes full employment and invariant income distribution, ruling out the main risks of trade and financial liberalization. Subject to these assumptions, it finds positive effects on growth. An important question, therefore, is how this conclusion changes if those assumptions are dropped. In this paper, we review existing projections of the TPP and propose alternative ones based on more realistic assumptions about economic adjustment and income distribution. We start from the trade projections put forward in the main existing study and explore their macroeconomic consequences using the United Nations Global Policy Model. 4 We find negative effects on growth in the United States and in Japan. We also find increasing inequality and job losses in all participating economies. Overall, we project the loss of 770,000 jobs, with the largest losses occurring in the United States. Furthermore, we project negative effects on growth and employment in non-TPP countries. This increases the risk of global instability and a race to the bottom, in which labor incomes will be under increasing pressure.

### 1ar TPP bad – growth

#### Neg studies make invalidated assumptions that mean their conclusions are wrong – tpp bad for global growth

**Capaldo and Izurieta 16**

Jeronim Capaldo is a Research Fellow with GDAE's Globalization and Sustainable Development Program. Previously he was Senior Researcher at GDAE and a member of the modeling and forecasting team at United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, where he was responsible for Latin America and the Caribbean and for the analysis of global employment. Prior to this, at the Food and Agriculture Organization, he analyzed the economic effects of climate change in Africa and Central America. Jeronim earned a Laurea cum laude in economics from the University of Rome “La Sapienza” and is currently a PhD candidate in economics at the New School for Social Research. His current research focuses on global macroeconomic models applied to trade and fiscal policy. Alex Izurieta is a Senior Economic Affairs Officer in the Division on Globalization and Development Strategies (GDS) of UNCTAD, previously at UN/DESA, New York. His area of expertise is the analysis of global economic developments and the evaluation of policy scenarios with the help of macro-economic and global models. Prior to joining the UN system, he worked as a Senior Researcher at the University of Cambridge, UK, as a Research Scholar at the Levy Economics Institute of Bard College, New York, and as a Researcher at the International Institute of Social Studies of Erasmus University in The Hague. He has published in those institutions and in various international journals. Trading Down: Unemployment, Inequality and Other Risks of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTE WORKING PAPER NO. 16-01, January 2016, http://www.ase.tufts.edu/gdae/Pubs/wp/16-01Capaldo-IzurietaTPP.pdf, msm

2.1. Critical Perspectives on the TPP

According to Rosnick (2013), the TPP will push down median wages in the United States making the vast majority of workers worse off. Also focusing on the US, Beachy (2015) points out that the TPP extends the model of the North American Free Trade Agreement with risks in terms of higher trade deficits, job losses and downward pressure on wages. Analyzing the impact of the Korea-US trade agreement, Scott (2013) has noted that actual gains from the TPP are not likely to meet expectations and that FTAs are not effective instruments of job creation. Focusing on sectoral effects, Bivens (2015) has warned that the TPP risks leading to lower demand for labor-intensive, domestic-oriented production in favor of capital-intensive, export-oriented production. As a result, the TPP may lead to lower employment and higher inequality within countries. Ffrench-Davis et al. (2015) have warned that the TPP provisions to liberalize capital flows eliminate important safeguards against the diffusion of financial crises. Finally, a study published by the US Department of Agriculture (Burfisher et al., 2014) finds that the TPP will lead to expansion of agricultural trade for the US. Interestingly, the study uses a global economic model, although it mainly discusses results for agriculture, and finds lower impact on GDP than other studies that use the same model. 5 Other studies have focused on aggregate economic impacts in specific countries. Using the GTAP model6 , Kawasaki (2011) has projected positive effects of the TPP for Japan. Analyzing the impact on Malaysia, Banga (2015) has pointed out that the common emphasis on exports is misleading. In fact, with production processes increasingly involving multiple countries (a phenomenon known as globalization of value chains), higher exports cannot be assumed to increase a country’s income. Only exports with a relatively high content of domestic value added contribute to national income. Based on this analysis, the TPP’s effects on Malaysia are estimated to be negative overall. Assessments have been also for non-participating countries. For example, Narayanan and Sharma (2014) have estimated a mixed outcome for India, while Thorstensen and Ferraz (2014) have estimated negative effects on Brazil. Only a few studies have offered projections of the TPP’s impact on the global economy. Using a computable general equilibrium model (CGE), Li and Whalley (2012) and Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012) have found that the TPP will have positive effects on all participating countries. More recently, the World Bank (2016) has also indicated that the TPP will have generally positive effects on participating economies and generally negative effects on non-participating economies. Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012) is the most widely cited study on the global effects of the TPP, and it is a complete and transparent application of the standard CGE model to this reform proposal. As such, it is useful to analyze it more in detail. Considerations on the latter’s methodology also apply to Li and Whalley (2012) and to World Bank (2016), which is based on an updated version of the model used in Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012). Although the technical details have not been published yet, the World Bank projections apparently differ from Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012) in two ways relying on an updated version of the same dataset and on more optimistic projections of the TPP’s effects on trade. However, neither improves the reliability of the results. On the one hand, the 2011 update of the database still excludes critical information, such as the generalized reversal of post-crisis stimulus packages, which only emerged after 2012. On the other hand, the optimistic expectations about the TPP’s effects on trade assume an unrealistic functioning of the economy. In particular, they assume that the higher savings generated through the TPP’s boost to corporate profits will be immediately invested in productive activities. But in contemporary economies savings do not necessarily generate investment.

#### Neg models are seriously flawed – data is skewed and assumptions are incorrect
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2.5. Methodological Issues Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012) employ the GTAP (2008) model, a computable general equilibrium model of the global economy commonly used to analyze the effects of trade liberalization. In the model, the world economy is divided into 24 country blocs -- each further subdivided into 18 sectors. In this representation of the economy, all commodity and factor markets, including labor, are constantly kept in equilibrium by perfectly flexible prices. 13 If, for example, the demand for cars were to drop below producers’ expectations, the model assumes that car prices will fall, ensuring that all production is sold. Faced with lower-than-expected profits, car producers who want to cut costs may reduce the number of workers employed. However, since labor markets also supposedly enjoy price flexibility, wages will fall, ensuring that all autoworkers remain employed, either in the car industry or in some other sector. Assuming such market-clearing mechanisms for all markets in the economy is not necessary to the functioning of a CGE model. For example, Storm (1997) and Taylor, Sarkar and Rattsø (1984) use CGE models to analyze the effects of trade liberalization in India assuming more realistic adjustment mechanisms. In both cases, the results highlight potentially adverse effects of liberalization that are absent from market-clearing models. However, many CGE models assume market-clearing in all markets, which is equivalent to assuming constant or full employment for the economy as a whole. 14 The contrast between this abstract mechanism and the reality of fluctuating unemployment in most countries is apparent. The full-employment assumption is of great consequence for the model’s results. Although the authors indicate that the TPP will inevitably force some sectors to contract, the full-employment assumption ensures that any jobs lost in those sectors are immediately replaced by new jobs in another sector. This implies that sector-specific skills do not impede the transfer of the labor force across sectors, an assumption at odds with the reality of persistent unemployment in many countries. In the United States, such transfers partially occurred after the 2008-2009 recession, since many workers took lower-paying jobs than those they held before the crisis. 15 Thus, even where the assumption of inter-sectoral labor mobility does, to some extent, reflect reality, it fails to capture the effects on workers’ incomes and aggregate demand. In the abstract world of models, the full-employment assumption inoculates economic projections against any adverse consequences that trade liberalization might have on economic activity and employment. In the standard CGE model used in Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), trade liberalization has no risks. 16 In specific circumstances, and for limited periods, a form of the full-employment assumption may have made sense in recent times too. One occurrence was the lead-up to the 2008 crisis when US fiscal and monetary policymakers were able to keep the economy on their inflation and employment targets despite several shocks (such as the bust of the dotcom bubble and the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center). But, those policy successes were based on the unsustainable accumulation of debt that led to the financial meltdown of 2008. Considering the recession and surge in unemployment that followed, the full-employment assumption was not a helpful instrument, even for the policymakers of the mid-2000s. Today, adverse economic shocks very often lead to higher unemployment, a fact that policy calculations must take into account. Furthermore, in many countries employment remains below full-employment levels for years after the latest recession. Clinging to the constant employment assumption is bound to give biased projections. In Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), full-employment is coupled with assumptions on income distribution that also insulate projections from the risk of a demand shortfall. First, income is assumed to accrue to a single representative household in each country bloc, thereby overlooking any distinction between wage earners and profit earners. The distinction is critical because individuals’ spending behavior is closely related to the source and amount of their income. If, on the other hand, we believe that profit earners receive higher incomes than wage earners, we must conclude that they have a higher propensity to save. For the economy as a whole, a higher concentration of income in the hands of profit earners leads to an increase in total savings and a reduction in spending, with adverse consequences for growth and employment. In the United States, the long-term decrease of the labor share of total income facilitated the accumulation of household debt. When debt accumulation eventually became unsustainable, household spending dropped, setting off the recession. Therefore, income distribution matters for total spending and employment. Any impact that trade policy might have on distribution should be carefully considered. Secondly, the model assumes that income distribution follows the “productivity rule”, according to which real wages increase at the same rate as productivity. If this were really the case, the share of labor incomes in total income would be stable over time. 17 Instead, the labor share has been decreasing in the US since the mid-1970s, and it has been far from stable in other TPP countries. Besides presuming full employment and abstracting from changes in the distribution of income, two additional assumptions constrain economic adjustment in Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012): a constant balance for the government budget and a balanced current account. These two assumptions greatly simplify calculations. But they rule out two common phenomena (government and current account deficits) that have large macroeconomic repercussions, including knock-on effects on aggregate demand, global imbalances and, ultimately, employment. If we are interested in the TPP’s macroeconomic effects, we cannot overlook the dynamics of government deficits and current accounts. In practice, government deficits vary widely, typically growing during recessions and decreasing, at least as a proportion of GDP, in periods of economic expansion. In the United States, after the 2009 fiscal stimulus was withdrawn (to allay worries over increasing federal debt), sustaining aggregate demand was left to heavily indebted households, corporate investment and foreign imports. Current accounts rarely feature a constant balance over time. In fact, the pre-recession period was characterized by large trade imbalances (deficits in the US and surpluses in East Asia) that have decreased since the crisis. However, contrary to the assumption of Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), trade flows have limited influence on the real exchange rate, which is strongly affected by other factors as well, especially international financial flows. Finally, the results obtained by Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012) depend strongly on the projected increase in foreign direct investment, estimated to generate, on average, 33 percent of the TPP’s total income gains. This is at odds with the findings in the literature that analyzes the causes and effects of FDI. As Ackerman and Gallagher (2005) note, there is no convincing theory that explains the effects of liberalization or FTAs on FDI, or indeed, any convincing evidence of an FDI-growth nexus. Given the difficulty of predicting FDI flows, the authors estimate the FDI effect through two series of assumptions. First, the potential increase in FDI stocks is estimated through a parameter that expresses the impact of changes in the World Bank Doing Business rank. The parameter is the same for all participating countries, implying the same increase in stock of FDI for any country that climbs a given number of ranks. Once the parameter is estimated, it is used to calculate the potential change in FDI stocks. It is assumed that signing the TPP will put all countries above the ninetieth percentile of the ranking, and that all FDI stocks will increase by at least 50 percent of the difference between the predicted level and their current level. Secondly, the “actual” FDI increase is calculated from the potential increase, assuming that the TPP investment provisions eliminate a maximum of two-thirds of investment barriers and that each country achieves this, depending on the number of FDI provisions it accepts. This procedure is used to justify the assumption that FDI will play a major role in making the TPP economically successful; using a similar GTAP model but without this highly moot procedure, Burfisher et al. (2014) came to far less rosy projections on the growth impact of the TPP.
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3. Alternative Projections Given the limitations highlighted in section 2, one obvious way to improve on the assessment of the TPP is to use a model based on more realistic assumptions about economic adjustment and income distribution and capable of tracing changes in income distribution, prices and financial flows to the assumed trade expansion. One such model is the United Nations Global Policy Model (GPM).21 3.1. Model The GPM, which has been in development since the 1970s and informs influential publications such as the UN's Trade and Development Report, is a demand-driven, global econometric model that relies on consistent macroeconomic data for every country (as explained in point c below). It has recently been used to project the effects of the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP), the other mega-regional trade agreement currently under negotiation (Capaldo 2014). Like the model used in Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), the GPM provides projections for every world region. However, the ways in which the projections are obtained in the two models are fundamentally different. Three main features differentiate the GPM from the model used by Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012)22: a) The mechanism of economic adjustment In Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), economic adjustment is based on the assumption of full employment. In contrast, the GPM recognizes that a demand shortfall can generate unemployment. In this logic, when firms face a reduction of sales, they try to preserve profits by firing workers. Unless they believe that the loss of business is transitory, they do not try to keep workers employed by negotiating lower wages. This is a more realistic assumption for the demand shortfalls associated with trade liberalization, in which relatively uncompetitive sectors inevitably contract -- sometimes forever, or for a long time. When a sector contracts, other sectors may suffer as well. For instance, when there is a loss of labor income in a sector, overall spending in an economy could go down. Unless additional demand from another source comes to the rescue, this process can lead to large job losses and drive the economy into recession. Economic adjustment in the GPM reflects this risk, instead of sidestepping the problem by assuming full-employment. Furthermore, in the GPM, economic adjustment is influenced by financial flows and stocks. Financial assets and liabilities contribute to determining consumption and investment, reflecting the growing importance of financial dynamics in today’s economies. Finally, we do not make any specific ex ante assumptions on current account balances. In fact, we find that the TPP will change these balances ex post. b) Income distribution In Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), income distribution is assumed constant. In contrast, the GPM recognizes that the labor share of total income has visibly changed in most TPP countries in the past three decades.23 In particular, the US labor share has decreased almost every year since the mid-1980s. At the firm level, where unit revenue is the price of the firm’s product, the labor share of income is the unit labor cost. Thus, a falling wage share in the economy means that, on average, unit labor costs have been falling. Proceeding backwards, if trade policy provides an incentive for firms to cut unit labor costs further in order to become more competitive on global markets, the labor share of income will continue to fall. This has serious consequences for the economy. With a shrinking share of total income, working households encounter increasing difficulties in purchasing the consumption and investment goods that make up domestic demand. As a result, the economy becomes increasingly dependent on debt, external demand or both. Income concentration may generate economic instability. Rather than assume a constant labor share, the GPM recognizes the importance of income distribution for macroeconomic performance. c) Data The GPM is based on a dataset of consistent macroeconomic data for every country. It includes data on financial flows, trade (of manufactured goods, commodities, energy and services), prices and labor. These follow strict accounting rules and the data is organized so as to ensure stock-flow consistency. The data used in this paper was updated in 2015, with the most recent historical data going back to 2013. Barring sudden shocks in the world economy, model-generated data for 2014 and 2015 are almost as reliable as historical data although undoubtedly still provisional.
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These results indicate that, when the TPP is analyzed with more realistic assumptions on economic adjustment, an expansion of trade volumes and even of trade’s net revenues can be offset by loss of domestic demand caused by the inevitable compression of labor incomes. Therefore, even assuming the same increase in trade volumes in TPP countries as in Petri, Plummer and Zhai (2012), we project negligible or negative impacts on growth. Following the combined effect of small or negative changes in GDP and changes in the composition of output required by the need to introduce labor-saving technologies, we project employment losses in every TPP country. This may be puzzling if we only focus on net exports. While an increase in net exports drives up incomes and employment, two other forces offset this positive impact: reduction of labor shares, which reduces consumers’ purchasing power, and change in the composition of output, with more capital-intensive and export-oriented production. While projected employment losses are small compared to the labor force, they clearly signal an adverse effect of liberalization not taken into account in full-employment models. In TPP countries, the largest effect will occur in the US, with approximately 450,000 jobs lost by 2025. Japan and Canada follow, with approximately 75,000 and 58,000 jobs lost respectively. The smallest loss – approximately 5,000 jobs – is projected to occur in New Zealand, where the increase in net exports is projected to be the largest. Overall, projected job losses in TPP countries amount to 771,000 jobs. In non-TPP countries, job losses are projected to be far larger, although still small relative to the size of the labor force. Specifically, employment in the European Union and other developed economies not participating in the TPP is projected to decrease by approximately 880,000 jobs by 2025. China, India, Indonesia and other developing economies not participating in the TPP are projected to lose approximately 4.5 million jobs. The dynamic processes that the TPP will activate will affect non-participating economies too, giving the TPP a truly global reach. Encouraging cost reductions and compression of labor shares in all member countries, the TPP will affect domestic demand, income distribution and employment in each country, but is unlikely to dramatically change competitiveness among them. Since all countries will reduce costs, no TPP country will gain a large advantage on other TPP members. Competitiveness is a relative feature. TPP countries are more likely to gain competitive advantages over non-TPP countries and increase their market shares at the expense of the latter. The question then becomes how non-TPP countries will react. One possibility is that they will engage in the global race to the bottom. In our simulation, we do not assume any specific reactions by non-TPP countries. But negotiations on TTIP and the recent proposals of a BRICS trade agreement indicate that an active, global quest for higher competitiveness may already exist. The risk with this prospect is that, with all countries cutting costs, losing jobs and aggravating already high levels of inequality, aggregate demand will suffer. This could compromise the ability of countries to achieve sustainable growth.

#### Neg authors are wrong and their models are flawed – tpp’s bad for global growth – our projections are sound
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The Trans-Pacifc Partnership (TPP) Agreement, recently agreed to by twelve Pacifc Rim countries led by the United States,1 promises to ease many restrictions on cross-border transactions and harmonize regulations. Proponents of the agreement have claimed signifcant economic benefts, citing modest overall net GDP gains, ranging from half of one percent in the United States to 13 percent in Vietnam after ffteen years. Their claims, however, rely on many unjustifed assumptions, including full employment in every country and no resulting impacts on working people’s incomes, with more than 90 percent of overall growth gains due to ‘non-trade measures’ with varying impacts. A recent GDAE Working Paper finds that with more realistic methodological assumptions, critics of the TPP indeed have reason to be concerned. Using the trade projections for the most optimistic growth forecasts, we find that the TPP is more likely to lead to net employment losses in many countries (771,000 jobs lost overall, with 448,000 in the United States alone) and higher inequality in all country groupings. Declining worker purchasing power would weaken aggregate demand, slowing economic growth. The United States (-0.5 percent) and Japan (-0.1 percent) are projected to sufer small net income losses, not gains, from the TPP. This GDAE Policy Brief is intended to help clarify theh diferences with other modeling studies and to present our fndings in a less technical manner. Flaws in TPP Economic Projections Optimistic claims about the TPP’s economic impacts are largely based on economic modeling projections published by the Washington-based Peterson Institute for International Economics.2 Its researchers used a computable general equilibrium (CGE) model to project net GDP gains for all countries involved. These fgures have been widely cited in many countries to justify TPP approval and ratifcation. Updated estimates, released in early 2016 and incorporated into the World Bank’s latest report on the global economy,3 now stress income gains for the United States of $131 billion, or 0.5 percent of GDP, and a 9.1 percent increase in exports by 2030.4 The projections methodology assumes away critical economic problems and boosts economic growth estimates with unfounded assumptions. The assumption of full employment is particularly problematic. Workers will inevitably be displaced due to the TPP, but CGE modelers assume that all dismissed workers will be promptly rehired elsewhere in the national economy as if part of labor ‘churning’. The full-employment assumption thus inflates projected GDP gains by assuming away job losses and adjustment costs. The modelers also dismiss increases in inequality by assuming no changes to wage and profit shares of national income. Again, this is not supported by empirical evidence, as past trade agreements have tended to reduce labor’s share. Finally, foreign direct investment (FDI) is assumed to increase dramatically, which contributes a signifcant boost to economic growth in the Peterson Institute projections, accounting for more than 25 percent of projected U.S. economic gains in the recent update. This assumes that: 1) income to capital owners will be invested; and 2) this will result in broad-based growth. Neither is supported by the evidence. A U.S. Department of Agriculture study,5 which did not assume such FDI-related investment gains, found zero growth for the United States and very modest growth elsewhere at best. The methodology of the Peterson study is fawed; consequently, growth and income gains are overstated, and the costs to working people, consumers and governments are understated, ignored or even presented as benefts. Job losses and declining or stagnant labor incomes are excluded from consideration, even though they lower economic growth by reducing aggregate demand. Some economists have pointed out additional misleading findings in the most recent Peterson Institute update: • U.S. income gains of 0.5 percent from TPP in 2030 – This is raised from the institute’s previous 0.4 percent, mainly by extending the implementation period from ten to ffteen years. In any case, added growth of 0.5 percent is very small, about 0.03 percent per year over ffteen years. • Exports rise by 9.1 percent, but so do imports, because the model assumes fxed trade balances. This excludes, by assumption, the problems associated with rising trade defcits, which have been common after previous trade agreements. • All displaced workers are absorbed immediately and costlessly in other sectors – again, by assumption. The paper does acknowledge that manufacturing employment will increase more slowly because of the TPP, and that some 53,700 more U.S. jobs per year will be “displaced” annually. But they view this as a small addition to normal labor market “churn.” More Realistic Economic Projections We employed the UN Global Policy Model (GPM) to generate more realistic projections of likely TPP impacts. Unlike most CGE models, the GPM incorporates more realistic assumptions about economic adjustment and income distribution, assessing the TPP impact on each of them as well as on economic growth over a ten-year period. Importantly, it does not assume large unexplained FDI surges or investment, growth and income gains due to nontrade measures. The modeling results are summarized in the table. To facilitate comparison, we used the Peterson Institute’s projected estimates of the TPP’s impact on exports, applying the macroeconomic model to assess the effects of projected TPP trade increases.7 The GPM analyzes macroeconomic sectors – primary commodities, energy, manufacturing and services – but does not contain data on single markets (such as car parts or poultry). The main findings include: • The TPP will generate net GDP losses in the USA and Japan. Ten years after the treaty comes into force, US GDP is projected to be 0.54 percent lower than it would be without the TPP. Similarly, the TPP is projected to reduce Japan’s growth by 0.12 percent. • For other TPP countries, economic gains will be negligible – less than one percent over ten years for developed countries, and less than three percent over the decade for developing countries. Chile and Peru’s combined gain of 2.84 percent comes to only about a quarter of one percent per year. • The TPP is projected to lead to employment losses overall, with a total of 771,000 jobs lost. The United States will be hardest hit, losing 448,000 jobs. • The TPP will also likely lead to higher inequality due to declining labor shares of national incomes. In the United States, labor shares are projected to fall by 1.31 percent over ten years, continuing an ongoing multi-decade downward trend. Conclusions In sum, the TPP will increase pressures on labor incomes, weakening domestic demand in all participating countries, in turn leading to lower employment and higher inequality. Even though countries with lower labor costs may gain greater market shares and small GDP increases, employment is still likely to fall and inequality to increase.
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#### TPP kills trade- regional deals solve best

\*Panitchpakdi votes aff in a heartbeat
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The Trans-Pacific Partnership is a step backwards to the days before the World Trade Organisation when the the United States and Europe controlled the global trading system to the detriment of developing economies, says a former WTO director-general Supachai Panitchpakdi. In New Zealand for a meeting of advisers to the Asia-New Zealand Foundation, Dr Supachai told BusinessDesk that Asian economies had more to gain by pursuing the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP), which includes China and India but not the US, than TPP, which he described as a "US-centric" trade deal. New Zealand is one of three countries that initiated the TPP concept and has committed substantial resources to its negotiation. But it only gained momentum once the US became a member of the 12-country grouping seeking a new set of trade rules for an Asia-Pacific trade bloc. The US and Europe are also negotiating a TPP-style deal, known as TTIP (Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership). "TTIP and TPP together could drive the world back into the old days before the WTO was conceived, a world trading system predominated by major trading nations, which was something I thought we tried to adjust with the more democratic participation of membership of the WTO," said Dr Supachai, who was director-general of the WTO from 2002 to 2005. New Zealand belongs to both TPP and RCEP, which was initiated in 2012, and is part of the four-year-old Association of South-East Asian Nations Free Trade Area (AFTA), most of whose members are involved in both TPP and RCEP. "For me, the priority should be for Asia to move in the direction of RCEP," said the former Thai deputy prime minister. "If there should be a need for the US to join in or others, it should be in the context of RCEP." As secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) between 2005 and 2013, Supachai also oversaw analysis of the North American Free Trade Agreement, which found that Mexico had done poorly from the deal while the developed economies in NAFTA - the US and Canada - had benefited. "At UNCTAD, we pointed out that for a developing country that joins a regional agreement with major, much more advanced economies, they are not easily going to gain much."

**1ar—TPP kills multilat trade**

**TPP undermines WTO cred—kills the multilateral order**

Matthews 4/30/15 – former Washington Post WonkBlogger, one of the staff members at Vox, an online media venture

(Dylan, Why Obama's big trade deal isn't a no-brainer for the world's poor, Vox, http://www.vox.com/2015/4/30/8517787/tpp-trade-global-poor)

"I remain a hardcore multilateralist. I really wish they'd put at least equal attention back into trying to get the WTO moving again," Elliott says. "That's the biggest potential negative impact for the vast majority of developing countries who are not party to these mega-regional agreements. **It's further undermining the credibility and the relevance of the multilateral system**. That's my number one concern."

**Bilateral FTAs distract from multilateral trading – causes a collapse of global free trade**

Bhagwati, 8—Senior Fellow @ CFR

Jagdish, senior fellow at CFR, ‘Termites in the Trade System,’ July 2, http://www.nysun.com/opinion/termites-in-the-trade-system/81080/

But Mr. McCain, like many others in America, is mistaken in thinking that freeing trade through Free Trade Agreements is a good idea. FTAs, which are better described as Preferential Trade Agreements, or PTAs, since they free trade for members only, is like freeing trade on a discriminatory basis. As I argue in my book, "Termites in the Trading System," FTAs have several crippling downsides that must be recognized. First, they will often divert trade from cheaper nonmember sources to more expensive member sources, bringing harm rather than good. Also, the enormous growth of such FTAs, now more than 350 and still growing, has led to a systemic effect: creating a "spaghetti bowl" of preferences and chaos in the world trading system. In one-on-one negotiations between America and weak, smaller FTA partners, several lobbies have imposed demands unrelated to trade on these nations, increasing resentments abroad. In Seoul, there was a street demonstration against the proposed U.S.-South Korea FTA. These lobbies include labor unions seeking to raise standards and production costs of rival firms abroad, financiers seeking absence of capital controls, and firms wanting higher patent protection. There are plenty of reasons to believe that these preferential trade agreements have slowed down our progress on the multilateral freeing of trade, as with the Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations. The Doha Round's success is essential to strengthening the multilateral trading system, which is beneficial to all. But the American doctrine of inducing multilateral trade liberalization by signing on FTAs has proven to be a chimera. Much attention and lobbying has been diverted to inconsequential deals. So we need to put a moratorium on more FTAs, while treating those already ratified as water under the bridge. The free traders who are passionate supporters of these FTAs are undermining everything that we have worked for to produce and strengthen a non-discriminatory trading system. There is no better example of folly wrought by good intentions.

**Bilateral deals are a sham – this undermines global free trade and solidifies global inequality**

Bhagwati and Panagariya, 3—Both Fellows @ CFR

Arvind and Jagdish, CFR, ‘Bilateral trade treaties are a sham,’ July 13, http://www.cfr.org/publication/6118/bilateral\_trade\_treaties\_are\_a\_sham.html

We are witnessing possibly the biggest divide between economists and politicians in the postwar period. Unfortunately, the economists are right. The politicians' lemming-like rush into bilateral agreements poses a deadly threat to the multilateral trading system. There are three reasons. First, bilateral trade deals are undermining an essential principle of the World Trade Organisation: that the lowest tariff applicable to one member must be extended to all members (the most favoured nation status rule). While it is true that the architects of the WTO/General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade exempted free trade areas from the MFN rule, they surely did not foresee that a proliferation of agreements would fragment the trading system. By the end of last year, 250 FTAs had been notified to the WTO. If those currently under negotiation are concluded, that number will approach 300. The result is a "spaghetti bowl" of rules, arbitrary definitions of which product comes from where and a multiplicity of tariffs depending on source. Second, if the Europeans started this fad, the Americans are now pursuing it with zeal, exploiting their hegemonic power and the lure of preferential access to a multi-billion dollar market. Unlike Brussels, Washington has adopted bilateral FTAs to advance the agendas of domestic lobbies, agendas that are not related to trade. The US is using one-on-one agreements with small countries as models for other multilateral trade agreements, hawking them around the world as the ideal way to further trade liberalisation. Third, America's tactic is weakening the power of poor countries in multilateral trade negotiations. Bilateral deals fragment the coalitions of developing countries, as each abandons its legitimate objections to the inclusion of extraneous issues in trade treaties. Having abandoned these objections in a bilateral deal with the US, how can those countries pursue them in WTO negotiations? The process of trade liberalisation is becoming a sham, the ultimate objective being the capture, reshaping and distortion of the WTO in the image of American lobbying interests.

### Squo Solves Trade

#### Status quo solves trade decline – China’s transitioning now but changes will be beneficial to global economy

Mattoo 5/2 (Aaditya Mattoo, Research Manager of trade and Integration at the World Bank, “Does the Global Trade Slowdown Have a Silver Lining?,” Brink News, 2 May 2016, <http://www.brinknews.com/does-the-global-trade-slowdown-have-a-silver-lining/>, \**fc*)

Lower commodity prices and China’s transition to a new growth path are two mutually reinforcing factors that created weak import demand in emerging economies. If China’s imports had not fallen in 2015, world merchandise import volume growth would have been close to half a percentage point higher. Lower commodity prices, driven by factors such as the glut in fuels, have reduced real incomes in commodity producers and led to a contraction in their imports from all regions, including China. At the same time, the gradual shift from investment to consumption in China, and the more significant contraction in its industrial production seen in early 2015, have reduced its imports from other regions, including commodity producers. But these developments do not necessarily spell doom and gloom in the longer term. First, China’s shift away from industrial production and to consumption may reduce imports of intermediate goods but is likely to create opportunities for exporters of final goods. Such reversals of fortune may already be visible. For example, countries like India and Australia, nearly 90 percent of whose exports to China were intermediate goods, saw exports to China decline by around 25 percent in the first three quarters of 2015 compared to the corresponding period in 2014. In contrast, countries like the UK and Vietnam, around one third of whose exports to China were consumer goods, saw exports to China grow by more than 30 percent. These shifts will deepen if domestic reform in countries from South Asia to South America equips them to step into China’s shoes. The gradual rebalancing of the economy from investment to consumption is also shifting China’s demand from goods to services. Part of this demand is being met by cross-border imports and consumption abroad. In the last five years, the index of China’s manufacturing exports has stagnated, but the index of services imports has grown 70 percent, and the share of services in imports has increased from just 15 percent to more than 21 percent. Further market opening in China and elsewhere could spur even greater dynamism in services trade. The decline in commodity prices too may have a silver lining. The immediate manifestation is a sharp decline in the incomes of the relatively few countries whose incomes depend largely on commodity exports. But the flip side is a small increase in the incomes of the relatively numerous countries whose import baskets include commodities. For example, real income shifts from oil exporters to oil importers could have a net positive effect on the global economy. Recent estimates suggest that a supply-driven decline of 45 percent in oil prices is associated with a close to 1 percent increase in global income over the medium term. History has shown us that imports are much more sensitive to sharp declines in income than to small increases in income. The asymmetry between commodity exporters and importers hurts global trade growth in the short-run. Facing sharply declining incomes, commodity exporters have no choice but to reduce their consumption and imports, especially if they face financial market pressures. Russia, for example, has cut back on import volumes by nearly 40 percent since the commodity price collapse in the middle of 2014. Commodity importers, in contrast, can choose to delay increases in consumption and imports. Thus, current global trade data may mostly reflect the rapid contraction in the imports of commodity producers. But this may be a good time for commodity importers to provide a much-needed boost to global demand. The commodity price plunge and China’s rebalancing have sharply affected trade. But what they are both taking away from global trade growth today, they may give back tomorrow provided the global community steps into the breach.

**Manufacturing Turn**

### 2ac TPP bad – manufacturing

#### TPA kills manufacturing and growth- reject their flawed data

\*YELLOW IS FUN METAPHORS FOR THE 1AR/2AR

Scott ’13 (Robert E. Scott, Robert E. Scott is director of trade and manufacturing policy research at the Economic Policy Institute. He joined EPI as an international economist in 1996. Before that, he was an assistant professor with the College of Business and Management of the University of Maryland at College Park. His areas of research include international economics and trade agreements and their impacts on working people in the U.S. and other countries, the economic impacts of foreign investment, and the macroeconomic effects of trade and capital flows. He has a Ph.D. in economics from the University of California-Berkeley, EPI, “No Jobs from Trade Pacts”, <http://www.epi.org/publication/trade-pacts-korus-trans-pacific-partnership/>, July 18, 2013)

The Trans-Pacific Partnership Could Be Much Worse than the Over-Hyped Korea Deal President Obama and his predecessors have frequently claimed that free trade agreements (FTAs) and other trade deals will lead to growing exports and domestic job creation. The president is currently negotiating two massive new FTAs that are likely to result in increased outsourcing and growing job losses, especially in the manufacturing sector. This paper reviews recent data on trade with South Korea after the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) took effect, and on trade flows after other free trade agreements. It concludes: Claims that trade deals increase exports and create jobs are based on flawed trade models, and on distorted and one-sided interpretations of the findings of those models. The flaws in trade models are exemplified in the U.S. International Trade Commission’s estimate that KORUS would increase U.S. goods exports by roughly $10 billion to $11 billion after fully phased in. This estimate focused solely on the impact of tariff cuts on exports, leaving out the effect of changes in foreign direct investment, outsourcing, and all of the other outcomes from trade deals provisions that impact trade flows. The USITC also estimated that imports from Korea would increase by about $6 billion to $7 billion, and that the U.S. trade balance with South Korea would improve by about $4 billion to $5 billion. In the year after KORUS took effect, U.S. domestic exports to South Korea actually fell $3.5 billion. Projections for 2013 suggest no reversal of this trend. The tendency to distort trade model results was evident in the Obama administration’s insistence that increasing exports under KORUS would support 70,000 U.S. jobs. The administration neglected to consider jobs lost from the increasing imports and a growing bilateral trade deficit. In the year after KORUS took effect, the U.S. trade deficit with South Korea increased by $5.8 billion, costing more than 40,000 U.S. jobs. Most of the 40,000 jobs lost were good jobs in manufacturing. There was also a big gap between predictions and outcomes for the North American Free Trade Agreement enacted in 1994: NAFTA was supposed to create 200,000 new jobs through increased exports to Mexico but, by 2010, growing trade deficits with Mexico had eliminated 682,900 U.S. jobs, with job losses in every U.S. state and congressional district. Given the big gaps between promised and actual outcomes, the United States should stop negotiating trade deals and fix the ones we have. Meanwhile, officials should insist that the U.S. International Trade Commission develop trade and investment models that more accurately estimate the effects of FTAs on trade, foreign investment, employment, wages, and the distribution of income, and that they fairly consider the effects of FTAs on both exports and imports, and their impacts on the economy. It is time to shatter once and for all the illusion that FTAs are only about exports. Trade and jobs under the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement When the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement was completed in 2010, President Obama said that it would increase U.S. goods exports by “$10 billion to $11 billion,” supporting “70,000 American jobs from increased goods exports alone” (The White House 2010).1 He based this claim on estimates from the U.S. International Trade Commission that tariff cuts alone in KORUS would stimulate U.S. exports to South Korea, supporting the president’s goals of doubling U.S. exports in five years, and adding 1 million new manufacturing jobs. Things are not turning out the way the president predicted. KORUS took effect March 15, 2012. In the year after the agreement took effect (April 2012 to March 2013), U.S. domestic exports to South Korea (of goods made in the United States) fell $3.5 billion, compared with the same period in the previous year, a decline of 8.3 percent. In the same 12-month period, imports from South Korea (which the administration consistently declines to discuss) increased $2.3 billion, an increase of 4.0 percent, and the bilateral U.S. trade deficit with South Korea increased $5.8 billion, a whopping 39.8 percent. Estimates for 2013 suggest no reversal in these trends, as discussed later in this paper. The administration is now negotiating a Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) that could include more than a dozen nations in the Asia-Pacific region (Office of the United States Trade Representative 2013d) including Malaysia, Vietnam, Japan, and South Korea (Hyun, Yeon-cheol and Jeong-hun 2013).2 Recently, China said that it was studying the possibility of joining the TPP talks (Bankok Post 2013). Many members of the proposed agreement have long histories of currency manipulation (Scott 2013b), dumping, and other unfair trade practices that have dramatically increased U.S. trade deficits and job losses, and the agreement could sharply curtail the ability of the United States to challenge these practices.3 The TPP would significantly increase the threat that rapidly growing trade deficits and job losses in the United States would be locked in if the TPP is completed. When it comes to trade, the issue is simple: Increased exports support U.S. jobs and increased imports cost U.S. jobs (Scott 2013c). Thus, it is trade balances—the net of exports and imports—that determine the number of jobs created or displaced by trade agreements. Unless trade agreements promise to reduce our too-high trade deficit, they will not have a net positive effect on U.S. employment. Rather than reducing trade deficits, past trade agreements have actually been followed by larger trade deficits. This is not some radical stance on trade—it is textbook economics. Nobel-prize winning economist and New York Times columnist Paul Krugman responded to claims that KORUS could fuel a recovery by noting that trade agreements are on average “a wash” (Krugman 2010). Specifically, in macroeconomic terms the United States had too little spending on domestically-produced goods and services, with total spending (Y) defined as: Y = C + I + G + X – M Where C is consumer spending, I is investment spending, G is government purchases of goods and services, X is exports, and M is imports. While trade agreements lead to higher X, they also lead to higher M, Krugman wrote. Exports support demand for domestically produced goods, so higher X increases employment. However, the growth of imports reduces demand for domestically produced goods, which reduces domestic employment. Using the president’s own formula relating changes in trade to jobs, the growth in the trade deficit with South Korea in the first year since KORUS took effect likely cost more than 40,000 U.S. jobs, most of them good jobs in the manufacturing sector because most traded goods are made by manufacturing industries.4 These losses are small when compared with the effects of the sequester, repeal of the payroll tax cuts, and other spending cuts that Congress allowed to take effect in 2013; these cuts have probably reduced GDP growth by about 1.5 percentage points this year (Bivens 2013a). But, taken together, austerity policies and the growing U.S. trade deficit with South Korea help explain why GDP and employment growth have slowed dramatically in 2013, and why manufacturing employment has declined steadily from a peak in February, falling through June 2013—a decline of 24,000 jobs in that period (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2013). No sign of an impending turnaround in U.S.-South Korea trade There is no evidence of a turnaround ahead in U.S.-South Korea trade. Looking ahead to projected full-year trade for 2013 (based on year-to-date trade through May) the trends so far get even worse, as shown in Figure A. U.S. exports to South Korea are projected to decline 7.3 percent ($2.9 billion) in 2013, while imports are expected to rise 7.7 percent ($4.5 billion), and the trade deficit is on pace to increase this year by nearly half (up 41.3 percent, or $7.4 billion).5 Unless the domestic economy suddenly improves, growing trade deficits with South Korea and other countries (such as China and Japan) will put additional downward pressure on U.S. manufacturing employment throughout 2013. FIGURE AInteractive U.S. trade with South Korea, 2000–2013 (estimated) NAIC Number U.S. domestic exports U.S. imports Trade balance 2000 26.3 39.8 -13.5 2001 20.9 34.9 -14 2002 21.2 35.3 -14.1 2003 22.5 36.9 -14.4 2004 25 45.1 -20.1 2005 26.2 43.2 -16.9 2006 30.8 44.7 -13.9 2007 33 45.4 -12.4 2008 33.1 46.7 -13.6 2009 27.1 38.8 -11.7 2010 36.8 47.9 -11.1 2011 41.3 56 -14.7 2012 40 57.9 -17.9 2013 37.1 62.3 -25.3 Billions of current dollars U.S. imports U.S. domestic exports Trade balance 2000 2002 2004 2006 2008 2010 2012 -50 -25 0 25 50 75 Note: 2013 trade data are estimated based on year-to-date trade through May 2013 Source: U.S. International Trade Commission (2013) and author’s analysis Show table Copy data to Excel Embed this chart Get image Macroeconomics does not explain the divergent trends in exports and imports shown in this figure. GDP growth slowed in both the United States and South Korea in 2011–2012, but the slowdown was steeper in the United States. In 2013, GDP growth is forecast to reach 2.8 percent in South Korea, but only 1.9 percent in the United States according to the International Monetary Fund (2013). Holding everything else constant, faster growth in South Korea should, theoretically, result in rising, and not falling, U.S. exports to that country, and a falling trade deficit.6 Why do forecasters keep getting it wrong? For more than two decades, presidents of both parties have claimed that new trade deals would result in rising U.S. exports and new job creation. Bill Clinton (1993) and his supporters claimed in the early 1990s that the North American Free Trade Agreement would create 200,000 new jobs through increased exports to Mexico.7 In fact, by 2010, growing trade deficits with Mexico had eliminated 682,900 U.S. jobs, with job losses in every U.S. state and congressional district (Scott 2011). The Obama administration claimed that “tariff cuts alone” in KORUS would increase U.S. exports to that country, but it isn’t working out as expected (The White House 2010). The White House cited research by the U.S. International Trade Commission (2010) to back up this claim. The USITC used a sophisticated Computable General Equilibrium (CGE) model to predict the impacts of tariff cuts on U.S. trade in 54 industries (U.S. International Trade Commission 2010, 2-1), and considered the impacts of the agreement on U.S. trade with both South Korea and the world as a whole. But this model focused primarily on projecting the impacts of tariff cuts on trade flows. Since U.S. tariffs are lower than those of most other countries (before FTAs), the model predicted that U.S. exports and at least bilateral trade balances would improve after FTAs take effect. But FTAs cover a lot more than just tariffs. The White House also seemingly cherry picked export numbers from the USITC study. The USITC report estimated that exports to South Korea would rise in the range of $9.7 billion to $10.9 billion, and Obama, as cited earlier, said KORUS would increase U.S. goods exports by “$10 billion to $11 billion.” But the administration ignored the projected impact of KORUS on imports, specifically, leaving out the USITC prediction that KORUS would increase imports in the range of $6.4 billion to $6.9 billion, producing an improvement of the bilateral trade balance ranging from $2.8 billion to $4.5 billion, not $10 billion to $11 billion as implied by Obama’s comment (U.S. International Trade Commission 2010, Table 2.1 at 2-9). The White House has refused to discuss the negative impacts of imports on the U.S. economy, and some officials at the Office of the United States Trade Representative have claimed before Congress that imports benefit the domestic economy—a highly suspect claim that will be addressed in a future EPI report. Evaluating trade deals by talking only about their impact on exports and ignoring imports is like trying to keep score in a baseball game by counting only runs scored by the home team. It engenders positive feelings but reveals nothing about how well a team is really doing. Talking only about trade deals and exports hides increased imports’ potential damaging effects on the national economy.8 The ‘lamppost problem,’ or, looking for answers where they cannot be found Both FTAs and the China-WTO accession agreement included numerous clauses designed to make those countries safe for U.S. and other foreign investors, to open markets for services and other traditionally nontraded goods, and to secure intellectual property and other investor rights (Scott 2012). But as Lori Wallach of Public Citizen has noted, agreements like KORUS “facilitate offshoring, ban Buy American provisions and erode manufacturing jobs, utterly contradicting the president’s domestic agenda” (Public Citizen 2013). There are a number of problems with the way the USITC studies the effects of such multifaceted agreements, and the way the USITC studies have been used by President Obama and his predecessors (similar USITC studies were done for most of the 17 other free trade agreements negotiated since NAFTA).9 A USITC study done for China’s entry into the World Trade Organization (U.S. International Trade Commission 1999) contained spectacularly unrealistic forecasts of the impacts of that agreement.10 The fundamental problem with the USITC model referenced in the president’s support for KORUS is that it is designed to evaluate the effects of tariff changes on trade flows. The structure of this model reflects most economists’ view that tariff cuts are the most important policy changes in FTAs—hence the USITC’s use of its CGE model as its lamppost to forecast the most important “economic effects” of these deals. Tariff-based trade models are the economic equivalent of a lamppost highlighting the ground far from where an inebriated man actually lost his wallet11—they shine light on the relationship between tariffs and trade, but they cannot be used to predict the impacts of FTAs on offshoring, on foreign and domestic investment in factories making products for export to the United State and other countries, on other factors affecting trade, investment, and wages that are unrelated to tariff changes. In the real world, the most important impacts of FTAs, as suggested by Wallach, are on outsourcing. This is reflected in data on foreign direct investment (FDI), a measure of the investment in factories and corporations by U.S. and other foreign multinational corporations (MNCs) to make goods for export from Mexico and China to the United States.12 Tariff-based CGE models have no ability to forecast the effects of trade agreements on FDI, or the operations of MNCs, including their trade flows. The USITC’s CGE lamppost can shine no light on such questions because it is not designed to evaluate the effects of trade agreements on FDI and MNC operations. FDI in Mexico nearly tripled, as a share of GDP, in the decade after NAFTA took effect, relative to a similar period before NAFTA, resulting in a huge increase in U.S. imports from Mexico (Scott 2011, Table 1 and Figure B). China is the largest recipient of FDI of all developing countries (Xing 2010) and is the third-largest recipient of FDI over the past three decades, trailing only the United States and the United Kingdom. Foreign-invested enterprises (both joint ventures and wholly owned subsidiaries) were responsible for 52.4 percent of China’s exports and 84.1 percent of its trade surplus in 2011 (Ministry of Commerce, China 2012). Outsourcing—through foreign direct investment in factories that make goods for export to the United States—has played a key role in the shift of manufacturing production and jobs from the United States to China since it entered the WTO in 2001. Foreign-invested enterprises were responsible for the vast majority of China’s global trade surplus in 2011. The United States lost 2.7 million jobs due to growing trade deficits with China between 2001 (when that country joined the WTO) and 2011, 76 percent of them in manufacturing industries (Scott 2012). KORUS is unique in that the results appear to be influenced, in part, by the effects of South Korean MNCs. In the first year under the agreement the U.S. has experienced rapidly rising imports of semiconductors, auto parts and ships from South Korea. These are all products of South Korean conglomerates (chaebol), large family–controlled firms with strong ties to government agencies (Watkins 2013). In 2013, U.S. exports of industrial machinery to South Korea have also fallen sharply, which may reflect competition from Korean firms. These changes help explain growing bilateral trade deficits and job losses. No thank you to another poorly evaluated FTA Despite the preponderance of evidence that FTAs and other trade deals do not work as expected, and have been harmful to the overall U.S. economy and to manufacturing in particular, President Obama has announced his intention to negotiate two massive new FTAs. The first is the TPP, a pact that could include a dozen countries in the Asia Pacific Region, as described earlier. In March, the president notified Congress that he intends to negotiate a Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) with the European Union (Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2013c). These negotiations began on July 8, 2008 (Office of the United States Trade Representative, 2013b). Although the core of the EU consists of high-income countries with many similarities to the United States, the 27-nation EU also contains many poorer countries from Eastern Europe such as Poland, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. Candidates for EU membership include Serbia and Turkey (European Union 2013), the latter of which is a large exporter and frequent violator of U.S. fair trade laws, especially in steel trade. If the United States negotiates an FTA with the EU, it could open up Eastern Europe and its Eurasian periphery to FDI, rapidly growing exports to the United States and growing U.S. job losses from trade with those regions. Nonetheless, the EU has confidently predicted that the TTIP will generate gains of 119 billion euros per year for the European Union (545 euros per average household per year) and 95 billion euros per year for the United States (655 euros per average household per year) (European Commission 2013). A much more likely outcome, based on North American experience under NAFTA, is that production workers in all the member countries will suffer falling wages and job losses (Scott et al. 2006), while U.S. and EU investors will profit handsomely, reinforcing the rapidly rising share of profits in corporate and national income that has taken place over the last decade in the United States (Mishel 2013). Bivens (2007, 2013b) has shown that while the nation as a whole may gain from trade, the benefits are concentrated among college-educated and nonproduction and supervisory workers, and in rising returns to capital. To the extent that the proliferation of FTAs has contributed to the growth in trade, especially with low-wage developing countries, as a share of the economy, FTAs have also contributed to the observed growth in U.S. wage and income inequality. The United States has experienced rapidly growing wage and income inequality over the past three decades (Mishel et al. 2012). As Bivens has shown, structural changes in the U.S. economy, including rapidly growing trade with low-wage less-developed countries are responsible for the rapid rise in wage and income inequality. These changes have not been accidental; rather they reflect a clear pattern of what Bivens (2011) flags as a “Failure by Design” in his book of the same name. The common thread FTAs and other trade agreements make it enormously profitable to outsource production to countries such as South Korea and China that use currency manipulation, dumping, and other unfair trade practices to undercut production and wages in the United States. U.S. MNCs, including Apple, Boeing, Dell, Ford, GE, GM, and Intel have also profited enormously from outsourcing to Mexico, China, and other low-wage trade partners under the protection of FTAs and the WTO. The end result is a race to the bottom in wages and working conditions for most members of these agreements (Inequality.is 2013). The United States should stop negotiating FTAs and trade deals and fix the ones we have.

#### Offshoring kills US advanced R&D

Lind 12 (Michael Lind is policy director of New America’s Economic Growth Program and a co-founder of the New America Foundation. Joshua Freedman is a program associate in New America’s Economic Growth Program. “ ,” pg online @ http://growth.newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Lind,%20Michael%20and%20Freedman,%20Joshua%20-%20NAF%20-%20Value%20Added%20America%27s%20Manufacturing%20Future.pdf //um-ef)

Manufacturing, R&D and the U.S. Innovation Ecosystem Perhaps the greatest contribution of manufacturing to the U.S. economy as a whole involves the disproportionate role of the manufacturing sector in R&D. The expansion in the global market for high-value-added services has allowed the U.S. to play to its strengths by expanding its trade surplus in services, many of them linked to manufacturing, including R&D, engineering, software production and finance. Of these services, by far the most important is R&D. The United States has long led the world in R&D. In 1981, U.S. gross domestic expenditure on R&D was more than three times as large as that of any other country in the world. And the U.S. still leads: in 2009, the most recent year for which there is available data, the United States spent more than 400 billion dollars. European countries spent just under 300 billion dollars combined, while China spent about 150 billion dollars.14 In the United States, private sector manufacturing is the largest source of R&D. The private sector itself accounts for 71 percent of total R&D in the United States, and although U.S. manufacturing accounts for only 11.7 percent of GDP in 2012, the manufacturing sector accounts for 70 percent of all R&D spending by the private sector in the U.S.15 And R&D and innovation are inextricably connected: a National Science Foundation survey found that 22 percent of manufacturers had introduced product innovations and the same percentage introduced process innovations in the period 2006-2008, while only 8 percent of nonmanufacturers reported innovations of either kind.16 Even as the manufacturing industry in the United States underwent major changes and suffered severe job losses during the last decade, R&D spending continued to follow a general upward growth path. A disproportionate share of workers involved in R&D are employed directly or indirectly by manufacturing companies; for example, the US manufacturing sector employs more than a third of U.S. engineers.17 This means that manufacturing provides much of the demand for the U.S. innovation ecosystem, supporting large numbers of scientists and engineers who might not find employment if R&D were offshored along with production. Why America Needs the Industrial Commons Manufacturing creates an industrial commons, which spurs growth in multiple sectors of the economy through linked industries. An “industrial commons” is a base of shared physical facilities and intangible knowledge shared by a number of firms. The term “commons” comes from communallyshared pastures or fields in premodern Britain. The industrial commons in particular in the manufacturing sector includes not only large companies but also small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs), which employ 41 percent of the American manufacturing workforce and account for 86 percent of all manufacturing establishments in the U.S. Suppliers of materials, component parts, tools, and more are all interconnected; most of the time, Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih point out, these linkages are geographic because of the ease of interaction and knowledge transfer between firms.18 Examples of industrial commons surrounding manufacturing are evident in the United States, including the I-85 corridor from Alabama to Virginia and upstate New York.19 Modern economic scholarship emphasizes the importance of geographic agglomeration effects and co-location synergies. 20 Manufacturers and researchers alike have long noted the symbiotic relationship that occurs when manufacturing and R&D are located near each other: the manufacturer benefits from the innovation, and the researchers are better positioned to understand where innovation can be found and to test new ideas. While some forms of knowledge can be easily recorded and transferred, much “know-how” in industry is tacit knowledge. This valuable tacit knowledge base can be damaged or destroyed by the erosion of geographic linkages, which in turn shrinks the pool of scientists and engineers in the national innovation ecosystem. If an advanced manufacturing core is not retained, then the economy stands to lose not only the manufacturing industry itself but also the geographic synergies of the industrial commons, including R&D. Some have warned that this is already the case: a growing share of R&D by U.S. multinational corporations is taking place outside of the United States.21 In particular, a number of large U.S. manufacturers have opened up or expanded R&D facilities in China over the last few years.22 Next Generation Manufacturing A dynamic manufacturing sector in the U.S. is as important as ever. But thanks to advanced manufacturing technology and technology-enabled integration of manufacturing and services, the very nature of manufacturing is changing, often in radical ways. What will the next generation of manufacturing look like? In 1942, the economist Joseph Schumpeter declared that “the process of creative destruction is the essential fact about capitalism.” By creative destruction, Schumpeter did not mean the rise and fall of firms competing in a technologically-static marketplace. He referred to a “process of industrial mutation— if I may use that biological term—that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating the new one.” He noted that “these revolutions are not strictly incessant; they occurred in discrete rushes that are separated from each other by spaces of comparative quiet. The process as a whole works incessantly, however, in the sense that there is always either revolution or absorption of the results of revolution.”23 As Schumpeter and others have observed, technological innovation tends to be clustered in bursts or waves, each dominated by one or a few transformative technologies that are sometimes called “general purpose technologies.” Among the most world-transforming general purpose technologies of recent centuries have been the steam engine, electricity, the internal combustion engine, and information technology.24 As epochal as these earlier technology-driven innovations in manufacturing processes and business models proved to be, they are rapidly being superseded by new technologydriven changes as part of the never-ending process of Schumpeterian industrial mutation. The latest wave of innovation in industrial technology has been termed “advanced manufacturing.” The National Science and Technology Council of the Executive Office of the President defines advanced manufacturing as “a family of activities that (a) depend on the use and coordination of information, automation, computation, software, sensing, and networking, and/or (b) make use of cutting edge materials and emerging capabilities enabled by the physical and biological sciences, for example, nanotechnology, chemistry, and biology. It involves both new ways to manufacture existing products and the manufacture of new products emerging from new advanced technologies.”25 Already computer-aided design (CAD) and computer-aided manufacturing (CAM) programs, combined with computer numerical control (CNC), allow precision manufacturing from complex designs, eliminating many wasteful trials and steps in finishing. CNC is now ubiquitous in the manufacturing sector and much of the employment growth occurring in the sector requires CNC skills or training. Information technology has allowed for enterprise resource planning (ERP) and other forms of enterprise software to connect parts of the production process (both between and within a firm), track systems, and limit waste when dealing with limited resources. Other areas in which advanced manufacturing will play a role in creating new products and sectors and changing current ones are: Supercomputing. America’s global leadership in technology depends in part on whether the U.S. can compete with Europe and Asia in the race to develop “exascale computing,” a massive augmentation of computer calculating power that has the potential to revolutionize predictive sci ences from meteorology to economics. According to the Advanced Scientific Computing Advisory Committee (ASCAC), “If the U.S. chooses to be a follower rather than a leader in exascale computing, we must be willing to cede leadership” in industries including aerospace, automobiles, energy, health care, novel material development, and information technology.26 Robotics: The long-delayed promise of robotics is coming closer to fulfillment. Google and other firms and research consortiums are testing robotic cars, and Nevada recently amended its laws to permit autonomous automobiles.27 Amazon is experimenting with the use of robots in its warehouses.28 Nanotechnology may permit manufacturing at extremely small scales including the molecular and atomic levels.29 Nanotechnology is also a key research component in the semiconductor indusmanutry, as government funding is sponsoring projects to create a “new switch” capable of supplanting current semiconductor technology.30 Photonics or optoelectronics, based on the conversion of information carried by electrons to photons and back, has potential applications in sectors as diverse as telecommunications, data storage, lighting and consumer electronics. Biomanufacturing is the use of biological processes or living organisms to create inorganic structures, as well as food, drugs and fuel. Researchers at MIT have genetically modified a virus that generates cobalt oxide nanowires for silicon chips.31 Innovative materials include artificial “metamaterials” with novel properties. Carbon nanotubes, for example, have a strength-to-weight ratio that no other material can match.32 Advanced manufacturing using these and other cuttingedge technologies is not only creating new products and new methods of production but is also transforming familiar products like automobiles. The rapid growth in electronic and software content in automobiles, in forms like GPS-based guidance systems, information and entertainment technology, anti-lock brakes and engine control systems, will continue. According to Ford, around 30 percent of the value of one of its automobiles is comprised by intellectual property, electronics and software. In the German automobile market, electronic content as a share of production costs is expected to rise from 20-30 percent in 2007 to 50 percent by 2020.33

#### Key to prevent conflict esclation

Paone 9 (Chuck, 66th Air Base Wing Public Affairs for the US Air Force, 8-10-09, “Technology convergence could prevent war, futurist says,” http://www.hanscom.af.mil/news/story.asp?id=123162298)

The convergence of "exponentially advancing technologies" will form a "super-intelligence" so formidable that it could avert war, according to one of the world's leading futurists. Dr. James Canton, CEO and chairman of the Institute for Global Futures, a San Francisco-based think tank, is author of the book "The Extreme Future" and an adviser to leading companies, the military and other government agencies. He is consistently listed among the world's leading speakers and has presented to diverse audiences around the globe. He will address the Air Force Command and Control Intelligence, Survelliance and Reconnaissance Symposium, which will be held Sept. 28 through 30 at the MGM Grand Hotel at Foxwoods in Ledyard, Conn., joining Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Norton Schwartz and a bevy of other government and industry speakers. He offered a sneak preview of his symposium presentation and answered various questions about the future of technology and warfare in early August. "The superiority of convergent technologies will prevent war," Doctor Canton said, claiming their power would present an overwhelming deterrent to potential adversaries. While saying that the U.S. will build these super systems faster and better than other nations, he acknowledged that a new arms race is already under way. "It will be a new MAD for the 21st century," he said, referring to the Cold War-era acronym for Mutually Assured Destruction, the idea that a nuclear first strike would trigger an equally deadly response. It's commonly held that this knowledge has essentially prevented any rational state from launching a nuclear attack. Likewise, Doctor Canton said he believes rational nation states, considering this imminent technology explosion, will see the futility of nation-on-nation warfare in the near future. Plus there's the "socio-economic linking of the global market system." "The fundamental macroeconomics on the planet favor peace, security, capitalism and prosperity," he said. Doctor Canton projects that nations, including those not currently allied, will work together in using these smart technologies to prevent non-state actors from engaging in disruptive and deadly acts. As a futurist, Doctor Canton and his team study and predict many things, but their main area of expertise -- and the one in which he's personally most interested -- is advanced and emerging technology. "I see that as the key catalyst of strategic change on the planet, and it will be for the next 100 years," he said. He focuses on six specific technology areas: "nano, bio, IT, neuro, quantum and robotics;" those he expects to converge in so powerful a way. Within the information technology arena, Doctor Canton said systems must create "meaningful data," which can be validated and acted upon. "Knowledge engineering for the analyst and the warfighter is a critical competency that we need to get our arms around," he said. "Having an avalanche of data is not going to be helpful." Having the right data is. "There's no way for the human operator to look at an infinite number of data streams and extract meaning," he said. "The question then is: How do we augment the human user with advanced artificial intelligence, better software presentation and better visual frameworks, to create a system that is situationally aware and can provide decision options for the human operator, faster than the human being can?" He said he believes the answers can often be found already in what he calls 'edge cultures.' "I would look outside of the military. What are they doing in video games? What are they doing in healthcare? What about the financial industry?" Doctor Canton said he believes that more sophisticated artificial intelligence applications will transform business, warfare and life in general. Many of these are already embedded in systems or products, he says, even if people don't know it.

**1ar—TPP Kills Manu**

**TPP devastates manufacturing—causes 39 billion dollar loss**

Irwin ’15 -- senior economics correspondent for The New York Times, previously a columnist at The Washington Post and an economics editor of its Wonkblog site

(Neil, 6-12-15 What You Should Know About the Trans-Pacific Partnership, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/13/upshot/what-you-should-know-about-the-trans-pacific-partnership.html)

**Loser: Manufacturing workers** The same estimates from Mr. Petri that point to higher service-sector activity point to losses from trade in machinery, transport equipment and other manufacturing sectors. Over all, his estimates put the net effect of the trade deal on manufacturing in the United States as a **$39 billion loss** by 2025.¶ Interestingly, manufacturing interests have been major supporters of the trade bill. They appear confident that even if more manufacturing activity moves abroad, American companies will be able to profit from it. But even assuming they’re right, less manufacturing activity in the United States would most likely mean downward pressure on employment and wages in the sector.¶ There is a longstanding program to try to offset the economic damage done to those who lose out from increased globalization, known as Trade Adjustment Assistance, which has accompanied past trade deals. The program became a hostage in the congressional debate Friday, as Democrats, normally staunch advocates of the adjustment assistance program, voted it down in an effort to stymie the overall push toward the deal.

**It’s the death blow**

Pete ’15 – Business reporter for The Times of Northwest Indiana

(Joseph S., 10/5/15, TPP trade deal 'may be the final blow to manufacturing in America', Northwest Indiana, http://www.nwitimes.com/business/tpp-trade-deal-may-be-the-final-blow-to-manufacturing/article\_79c11e94-4c58-5fef-b7d5-1c779cfaadba.html)

Now the U.S. has wrapped up negotiations on another major trade partnership, the 12-nation Trans Pacific Partnership.¶ Unions and business groups fear it could further gut American manufacturing and wipe out more good-paying factory jobs.¶ "From what we know, the draft TPP threatens the future of production and employment," said Leo Gerard, president of United Steelworkers International. "It compromises the so-called 21st century standards that were supposed to form the foundation for this agreement. It will deal a critical blow to workers and their standard of living in the United States." ¶ Gerard noted the final text hasn't been made available yet.¶ "From what we have seen and know, at its core the hastily concluded TPP deal will simply continue today's outdated, disastrous approach to trade," he said.¶ Gerard said the deal should not even be submitted to Congress, and Congress should reject it if it is.¶ "You only have to look at the consistently dismal job numbers in manufacturing to understand what every manufacturing worker already knows: We have been on the losing end of trade deals," he said.¶ Gerard said it appears "misguided foreign policy and global corporate interests have trumped sound economics and the opportunity to get things right."¶ He said negotiators are trying to push it through Congress before elections next year.¶ Proponents sell TPP as a way to write the rules of trade in the Pacific Rim before China does, but it would in fact benefit Chinese interests, Gerard said. The deal for instance would give preferential treatment to cars with a majority of Chinese-made auto parts if China decided to join.¶ "In many other areas critical to workers, U.S. negotiators refused to take the advice that was provided to them time and time again by the representatives of working people," Gerard said. "But while supporters tout the deal, those promises will fall on deaf ears."¶ At a time when a record amount of steel imports are flooding in, Gerard fears the new trade deal could be catastrophic.¶ "**TPP may be the final blow to manufacturing in America**," he said.¶ He said workers and producers remain "under siege" from overseas "overproduction, foreign currency devaluation, our own lack of long-term infrastructure investment and the strong dollar."¶ "Trade policy is not the only issue that determines what the economic prospects will be for working people," he said. "Trade is the critical link to the world economy and global pressures are being felt in virtually every occupation and in every workplace."¶ Robert Scott, director of trade and manufacturing policy research for the Economic Policy Institute, said the deal would likely depress wages, displace workers and drive up trade deficits.¶ TPP fails to address issues like currency manipulation and abuse of workers, he said.¶ The steel industry may especially be at risk, since China has most of the world's excess steel overcapacity.¶ TPP encourages outsourcing to "low-wage export platforms" like Malaysia and Vietnam, he said. It also creates a way "for dumped and subsidized imports from China" and other nations to enter product into the U.S. at preferential TPP tariff rates or duty free, Scott said.¶ He said the U.S. could have had a TPP to address "currency manipulation, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and harmonized financial regulations upwards."¶ "Instead, the TPP supports a race to the bottom in international regulations that will primarily benefit multinational corporations at the expense of workers and consumers in the United States and other TPP countries," Scott said.¶ The U.S. Business and Industry Council said the deal fails to serve the interest of American manufacturers and workers. The group said the deal supported "government-managed trade" just for the sake of a presidential legacy.¶ "The omission of meaningful currency language is not only a deal-breaker, but also an open invitation to Japan, Malaysia and Singapore, among others, to continue to use currency cheating to gain competitive advantage over American companies," Council President Kevin Kearns said.¶ He said a lack of currency provisions signals to China and other countries "they are 'home free' and can continue to use currency market interventions to boost sales without fear."

**1ar—TPP kills steel industry**

**Specifically—TPP kills the steel industry**

Brodey ‘15 -- MinnPost's Washington correspondent

(Sam, 6/10/15, How Minnesota would benefit — and how it would suffer — if Congress approves the Trans-Pacific Partnership, Minnesota Post, https://www.minnpost.com/politics-policy/2015/06/how-minnesota-would-benefit-and-how-it-would-suffer-if-congress-approves-tra)

The mining industry in Minnesota and elsewhere would probably be more hurt than helped by an agreement like TPP. Eighth District Rep. Rick Nolan has been vocal in his opposition to TPP on the grounds that it would have disastrous effects on his district’s mining industry. Key to his concerns is distrust of overseas companies — and several TPP signatories — who could potentially flood the U.S. market with steel and other products subsidized by their governments, putting U.S. products at a disadvantage.¶ In an op-ed in the Mesabi Daily News, Nolan explained, “Australia — one of our so-called ‘partners’ in this venture — is already in the process of doubling the amount of iron ore on the world market today. If the Trans-Pacific Partnership is approved, we can expect a flood of cheap Australian iron ore to enter our marketplace — costing us thousands more good jobs and very possibly **the collapse of America’s steel industry as we know it**.” Minnesota taconite operations have laid off more than 1,000 workers in the last year because of that practice, which industry advocates refer to as “steel-dumping.”

**Domestic steel industry key to competitiveness & national security**

Buyer 7 — Steve Buyer, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives (R-Indiana), Colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve, holds a B.S. from The Citadel and a J.D. from Valparaiso University, 2007 (“Statement of Representative Steve Buyer Before the International Trade Commission Regarding the five-year sunset review on Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from Argentina, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Netherlands, Romania, South Africa, Taiwan, Thailand, and Ukraine (Inv. Nos. 701 -TA-404-408 and 731 -TA-898-908),” July 31st, Available Online via EDIS (Document # 279239), http://www.usitc.gov/trade\_remedy/731\_ad\_701\_cvd/investigations/2006/hot\_rolled\_steel\_products\_from\_argentina/PDF/Hot%20Rolled%20(Review)%20Hearing%20Day%201.pdf)

A robust steel industry I believe is fundamental to the security and economic viability of this nation. If you were to contemplate 10 resources considered essential for the successful establishment of a nation you would think on your list you need potable water, you need food, you need medical. I would submit you need steel would be one of the 10. A fruitful domestic steel industry maintains its viability I believe by being adaptive, technologically savvy and flexible so it can maintain its competitive edge in the world market. That competitive edge lends itself to economic security and stability here at home. Both of those elements are vital ingredients to our nation's ability to develop and maintain an adequate defense I believe we must remain vigilant to protect ourselves from a future without steel making infrastructure sufficient to meet our national defense needs. In the years that have followed the tragic events of September 11, national defense has dominated public attention. When contemplating the tumultuous nature of this global war against terror we must think about should we be reliant upon the kindness of others, especially when it comes to meeting our steel needs? The Congress, in the past we've contemplated this issue. We say that we're not going to permit others to build the hulls of our ships. We'd even protect the manufacturing of propellers. There's a long list of things under the national security requirements that we've said no, we are going to ensure that they are made here in the United States There are certain types of steel that we have to be very careful, protective plating, and armor and things like that, that we have to be very, very cognizant about where we're going. A hyper dependence upon trusted friends and allies may not be wise since they also have requirements for their own steel. So we have our treaties, and we have our agreements, and we have to be interoperable and will trade among each other, but there are certain things that we have to be cognizant of in our steel making capability. Simply put, the defense of our nation depends on steel. Our aircraft carriers, cruisers, tanks, humvees, et cetera, are all made of steel. We cannot become dependent on foreign sources for this material. The United States being the only super power of the world, we cannot project our force by our air train or sea train without this ingredient called steel. The whole world relies on us, so it is in our national interest to maintain this vigorous steel industry. The economic stability of the steel industry here at home and our ability to remain competitive abroad as I said directly impacts our national security. The efficient low cost producers that comprise the membership of our domestic steel market can compete effectively against any foreign producer in a fair global economy. You have given the steel industry some breathing room. It has invested billions of dollars to modernize itself while stimulating an environment to be competitive and compliant. It has learned the hard way the benefit of cutting edge technology. These producers are heavily concentrated in northwest Indiana, and at the end of 2006 they employed over 19,000 in that region. Companies like Nucor and Steel Dynamics are located within my Congressional district in Crawfordsville and Pittsboro, Indiana They contribute substantially to ensure a healthy local economy, and they also contribute. I believe to our stable and healthy national economy. The nation's annual production, over 100 million tons of steel, which Indiana is the second largest producer among the states, keeps this country at the top of the worldwide steel industry. However, if the competitive nature of this market is unfairly influenced by steel dumping or illegal subsidies given to foreign producers by their governments or other entities the integrity of the domestic and global market is jeopardized. In those instances, the domestic market loses its ability to effectively compete with the global rivals. When that occurs it negatively impacts the economic stability of our steel industry which in turn threatens our national security. We need to ensure that companies have the opportunity to modernize and grow to adequately meet the demands of the global market without the fear of substantial financial damage from unfair or illegal trade practices. To ensure that our nation's defense remains adequate and capable we must continue to enable mechanisms that will influence other countries to play by the rules. Simultaneously, we must be cognizant and take appropriate action to recognize those instances in which antidumping and countervailing duties are no longer required to safeguard our economic and security interests. In either instance we cannot allow to go unchallenged the continuous violations of international and U.S. trade laws that tend to skew the market and undercut our ability to compete fairly and have our economy grow and flourish. The preservation of the economic integrity of our domestic steel industry is fundamental to our ability to protect the very existence of a nation. So please take under consideration while contemplating your decision in this matter the vital instrument to our national security which lies in your hands. Thank you very much.

**1ar—manu K2 competitiveness**

**Manufacturing is key to competitiveness and the economy – spills over to all other sectors**

**Sperling 12** – Director of the National Economic Council

(Gene Sperling, lawyer and political figure, currently serving as Director of the National Economic Council, 3/27/12, “REMARKS BY GENE SPERLING BEFORE THE CONFERENCE ON THE RENAISSANCE OF AMERICAN MANUFACTURING” http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/administration-official/sperling\_-\_renaissance\_of\_american\_manufacturing\_-\_03\_27\_12.pdf)

Yet, we do believe that even if today only 12 percent of the U.S. private-sector workforce is employed in manufacturing, it is a sector that punches above its weight. When you take into account the outsized role that manufacturing plays in innovation – through R&D investment and patents; the tight linkage between innovation and manufacturing production; higher-wage jobs it produces; its importance for exports; the spillover benefits that manufacturing facilities have on firms and communities around them, and the deeper economic harm that comes from allowing our manufacturing production capacity to be hollowed out – it becomes clear that manufacturing is worthy of a special emphasis in the Obama economic strategy. So let me now address some of the key points often under contention and express why we believe the Obama economic focus on manufacturing is economically justified. Positive Spillovers: Location, Innovation, and National Competitiveness The economic evidence is increasingly clear that a strong manufacturing sector creates spillover benefits to the broader economy, making manufacturing an essential component of a competitive and innovative economy. While we know that economists often start from the premise that any type of preferential treatment of a single type of investment over another is viewed as distortionary, we also know that when an economic activity has positive spillover effects that an individual firm cannot capture, there is a risk we as a nation under-invest in areas that can be beneficial to the economy at large. There is, for example, a broad consensus that the benefits of R&D investment go beyond what can be captured by any individual firm and are worth government investment - in areas from basic research to the R&E tax credit for companies. Likewise, economic studies have shown that there are clear and measurable spillover benefits from manufacturing activity that benefit the locations and particularly nations that house such manufacturing activity. For example, a 2010 study by economists Michael Greenstone, Rick Hornbeck and Enrico Moretti found that when a manufacturing plant chooses to invest in a county, the investment resulted not just in new production at the site of the plant, but actually increased productivity of other firms in the surrounding area – a concept that economists refer to as an “agglomeration spillover.” Other economic studies reinforce the insight that the location of manufacturing impacts who benefits from such “knowledge spillovers.” A study published in the American Economic Review by economist Wolfgang Keller – examining manufacturing R&D in 14 countries over 25 years – found that such spillover benefits decline with distance, indeed by over half when they are more than 700 miles away. Even more telling, as economist Lee Branstetter from Carnegie Mellon – currently on Alan Krueger’s team at the President’s Council of Economic Advisors – found when looking at industries in the U.S. and Japan, knowledge spillovers from industrial activity are primarily “intra-national” in scope. That is to say, the bulk of the benefits stayed within the country where the activity occurred. A large number of studies confirm these results, and to the degree that such spillover benefits decline with distance and are most significant within national boundaries, it is certainly fair to think of the need to invest and preserve manufacturing activity as an issue of national competitiveness. This research is part of the reason there has been a growing focus on the importance of proximity between the activity of innovation and the activity of manufacturing. If we care about the location of the innovation, we should also care about the location of the manufacturing production. More than any other industry, manufacturing firms account for a disproportionate share of innovative activity in the U.S. – 70 percent of private sector R&D and over 90 percent of patents issued. As a country, it matters where these benefits occur. Part of the reason for this is that the knowledge and capabilities gained by production – in making things – support the design and innovation of new products and new processes. MIT recently launched a research initiative called Production in the Innovation Economy – or PIE – to as they described it, “analyze production in the United States and to propose new routes from innovation through manufacturing to jobs and growth in the United States.” Indeed, many see MIT’s PIE project as premised on the belief that the separation of design and innovation from manufacturing that we have seen in the production of many information technology (IT) products may be more the exception than the rule for emerging technologies. In defense of this premise, Professor Suzanne Berger, co-chair of PIE, wrote that, “There is a close connection between R&D and manufacturing in many of the emerging sectors because modularization [separation of design and production] may just not work as well for these technologies as it has for IT. R&D engineers may have to stay close to manufacturing to develop new strategies for making processes more efficient. The tighter integration of innovation and production may also present opportunities to bring design closer to end users, as advanced manufacturing technologies make it possible to produce higher-value goods at lower volume.” It is this very understanding that causes MIT’s President Susan Hockfield (and co-chair of the President’s Advanced Manufacturing Partnership) to write that the loss of manufacturing “not only destroys manufacturing jobs, but also saps our inventive advantage.” And it is this understanding of the importance of proximity between manufacturing and innovation that explains why Boeing moved their engineers out of their offices and into their assembly plants, why Intel manufactures its latest chips in the U.S., near where the design itself occurs, and why Bell Labs, the source of incredible innovation during the 20th century, “housed thinkers and doers under one roof,” because they knew that understanding how to make things helped them to innovate. The ecosystems that grow up around these intersections of innovation and production tend to be complex. They are the result of evolutions that occur over periods of years and decades. Once the virtuous, reinforcing cycles are broken they are difficult to recreate, and they can turn to a vicious cycle. That’s why losing pieces of our manufacturing base should be such a serious concern. In a 2009 article, Harvard Business School professors Gary Pisano and Willy Shih explain these dynamics. They refer to the virtuous cycle as the “industrial commons,” the secret sauce of innovative know-how, process engineering capabilities, and workforce skills required for innovation in many manufacturing industries. The virtuous cycle happens when firms move to a region to tap into the “commons,” further enhancing the learning and capabilities in the area, accelerating innovation, and bringing in even more investment. But Pisano & Shih make this point to show that the reverse is also true. The virtuous cycle can become a vicious cycle, where following the loss of manufacturing capacity, the unique process engineering expertise cannot be maintained and our innovative capacity is drained. For any single firm, the decision to move production elsewhere may make economic sense. But that decision impacts suppliers and the local talent pool. This makes the decision even easier for the next firm to leave and even harder for the next firm considering coming there to say yes. Without these capabilities, companies do not create the process technologies that allow firms to create and scale new products. So when we remain indifferent to the decision to compete for the manufacturing products of the present, we have to understand that if it leads to a more serious loss of our manufacturing capacity, it can trigger the loss by our nation of the ability to compete for and create the next generation of technologies. It’s a story we’re already all too familiar with in the United States. In consumer electronics. In metal castings. In machine tools and others. In each industry, firms shifted production out of the U.S., sometimes as products became commoditized. The subsequent loss of manufacturing capabilities led to leadership in other industries being developed elsewhere. For example, when we lost consumer electronics manufacturing, we gave up a claim on future innovation. We lost in follow-on products like advanced batteries, flat-panel display technology and LED lighting. When we lost consumer electronics manufacturing, we also lost the capability to make and design the batteries, including lithium-ion batteries, used in computers, cell phones, and other consumer devices. As demand for batteries began to grow in the auto industry for hybrids and in utilities for grid storage, the technological leadership to design these products had migrated along with consumer electronics manufacturing. We lost the ability to create these products at scale. Through the Recovery Act, the U.S. made major investments to re-start the advanced battery industry in the U.S. We are on track to go from 2 percent of global production in 2009 to 40 percent of global capacity by 2015. Without that type of effort, it is unclear if this important industry would have taken root in the U.S. Of course, dynamism – the so-called “creative destruction” and fierce global competition – are facts of economic life. We can never pretend that we can or should drive them to a halt. What the facts mentioned above demonstrate, however, is that we have a national economic interest in ensuring that as dynamic competition proceeds, we as a country must understand the importance of ensuring an environment where our manufacturing sector will not lose the ability to compete for the next advance, the next big thing, the next opportunity to create value and jobs on our shore.

**Manufacturing key to economy—diversification**

Ettlinger and Gordon 11

Michael Ettlinger is the Vice President for Economic Policy at American Progress, Kate is a Senior Fellow at American Progress. “The Importance and Promise of American Manufacturing,” April, http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2011/04/pdf/manufacturing.pdf

Beyond defense, however, manufacturing offers a greater degree of economic security. The simple existence of the sector helps balance out other sectors to create a more stable economy overall.11 Had, for example, manufacturing been a larger share of the economy at the time of the recent housing and financial crises, the fragility of those two sectors would not have been quite as devastating to the overall economy.12¶ Indeed, when multilateral development banks such as the World Bank Group fund international projects in the developing world, they often point to the importance of a “diverse economy”—that is, an economy based on a wide range of profitable sectors, not just a few—as essential to sustained, broad-based economic growth. The same holds true for industrialized nations.¶ This kind of analysis, however, is seldom done in the United States at the national level because we have had a diverse economy overall. Individual regions and states, however, can be significantly less diversified.13 For this reason, states often develop economic plans aimed at making their economies more diverse. For instance, for- mer Michigan Gov. Jennifer Granholm specifically set out to diversify her state’s economy away from traditional auto manufacturing and into other sectors such as solar technology, wave power, and electric drive trains.¶ This kind of economic development strategy is rarely tried at the national level, however, perhaps due to concerns about excess involvement of government in the operation of the economy. Still, research abroad and at the regional level in the United States makes clear that putting too many of our eggs in one sectoral basket is a bad bet for long-term stability.14 Manufacturing, like any sector, is affected¶ by economywide events, but manufacturing’s internal diversity—supplying consumer goods as well as industrial goods, serving both domestic and external markets—gives it great potential resiliency in addition to simply adding one more leg for the broader economy to stand on.

**1ar—competitiveness impact ext**

**Competitiveness is the key determinate of great power war**

Drezner 1

Daniel Drezner (professor of international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University) 2001 “State structure, technological leadership and the maintenance of hegemony” <http://www.danieldrezner.com/research/tech.pdf>

In this decade, proponents of globalization argue that because information and capital are mobile, the location of innovation has been rendered unimportant.6 While this notion has some popular appeal, the globalization thesis lacks theoretical or empirical support. Theoretically, even in a world of perfect information and perfect capital mobility, economists have shown that the location of technological innovation matters.7 Empirically, the claims of globalization proponents have been far-fetched. Capital is not perfectly mobile, and increased economic exchange does not lead to a seamless transfer of technology from one country to another.8 The location of innovation still matters. Long-cycle theorists have paid the most attention to the link between technological innovation, economic growth, and the **rise and fall of hegemons**.9 They argue that the past five hundred years of the global political economy can be explained by the waxing and waning of hegemonic powers. Countries acquire hegemonic status because they are the first to develop a cluster of technologies in leading sectors. These innovations generate spillover effects to the rest of the lead economy, and then to the global economy. Over time, these ‘technological hegemons’ fail to maintain the rate of innovations, leading to a **period of strife** until a new hegemonic power is found.

**Pharma Turn**

**2ac TPP bad – pharma**

**TPP jacks generic drug prices**

Fernholz 11/9 -- covers state, business and society for Quartz

(Tim, Under the TPP, America’s insanely high drug prices will be an unappreciated export, Quartz, http://qz.com/543385/under-the-tpp-americas-insanely-high-drug-prices-will-be-an-unappreciated-export/)

With the unveiling last week of all 6,000 pages of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), fans of abstruse trade law can spend some time digging into the meaty goodness of tariff schedules and regulatory harmonization designed to boost trade.¶ But there is one chapter health-care advocates are focused on—and they say it will likely make vital medicine more expensive in the poorer countries involved in the pact.¶ The TPP was agreed to earlier this year by 12 nations including the US, Mexico, Canada, Japan, Vietnam, Peru, and Chile, and now awaits ratification; South Korea and Indonesia are expected to join in the coming years. Though the US in the end relented on some of its demands to protect its drug makers from competition—to the point where some US trade boosters threatened to pull their backing for the deal—the TPP still obliges signatory countries to accept many of the patent rules that help drug firms keep prices high in the US.¶ The origins of these new rules in the entangled worlds of high-tech medical businesses and government regulation illustrate the compromises that have to be made in reconciling market forces with the public good. And they show how a powerful industry has a habit of ending up on the winning side of those compromises.¶ US drugs already have strong patent protections¶ US patents on traditional drugs last 20 years; once they expire, competitors can apply for permission to market a generic version. Generic manufacturers don’t have to repeat the entire costly process of clinical trials, though; a 1984 law called the Hatch-Waxman Act lets them rely on the brand-name drug’s clinical data if they can prove their generic drug is an equivalent.¶ Brand-name drug makers were aghast at the idea of allowing rivals to use their expensive clinical data to start robbing them of market share, of course. So Hatch-Waxman also contains a compromise: five years of “data exclusivity” after the 20-year patent expires, during which no one else can use brand-name clinical data to get a drug approved.¶ Generic drugs developed under this system have helped consumers in the US and around the world. But there is a strong case that 25 years of protection for traditional drugs is too long—and ultimately, a way for investors to extract rents (like the infamous case of Martin Shkreli, who bought a drug and raised the price 5,000%) rather than an incentive for innovation.¶ Obamacare made some protections even stronger¶ Nonetheless, certain kinds of drug patents ended up even better protected under the Obama administration’s Affordable Care Act (ACA).¶ The president and his team knew well that to pass a comprehensive overhaul of the health-care system, they’d need the health industry’s powerful players—big hospital chains and pharmaceutical makers, mainly—on their side, even as they found ways to spend less money on them.¶ To gain pharma’s support, the administration not only agreed not to use the government’s negotiating power to drive down drug prices, but also endorsed a 12-year period of data exclusivity for “biologics”—a class of drugs based not on inert chemical compounds but instead created from living cells, and seen as the next big thing in medical research. This concession was made despite arguments in a 2009 Federal Trade Commission report that biologics don’t need that kind of protection (pdf) because generic versions of them, known as biosimilars, are more difficult to develop than traditional generics.¶ **Now the TPP is exporting those protections**¶ The US sought to accomplish a half-dozen sometimes conflicting goals with the TPP: Open new markets for US exports and especially services; deepen economic linkages with Pacific states in a bid to contain China; convince China to continue liberalizing its economy; and generally raise economic standards, such as labor rights and environmental regulations, at a time when the main forum for doing this, the World Trade Organization, was deeply deadlocked.¶ Even supporters of the pact in America concede that it will result in low-skilled manufacturing jobs leaving the US for other countries. Though US negotiators included worker protections in the treaty, including the right to unionize, the wage gap between the US and, say, Vietnam or Peru, is just too large for many manufacturers to ignore.¶ But that sacrifice will be balanced out by benefits to US service industries, particularly those that make their money off intellectual property. When it comes to tech companies or Hollywood films, the higher prices these protections bring can be onerous to consumers, but arguably a lot more so when they involve prices not for entertainment but for health and medicines.¶ With Republicans in control of Congress, gaining approval of the TPP would in part be contingent on the support of pharma. So US negotiators presented demands opposed by every other country in the talks. The 12-year data exclusivity proposal for biologics was the most controversial, since it was new, well beyond global norms, and considered unnecessary by well-respected authorities. In the end, it was wrangled down to a range of five to eight years.¶ Get ready for higher drug prices in other TPP countries¶ While the final agreement was significantly less restrictive than some advocates feared, trade lawyers who reviewed the intellectual property chapter (pdf) say it protects pharmaceutical patents more than previous trade deals do—in particular the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), a global floor on patent rules that has loopholes to ensure cheap access to medicines.¶ As well as the five to eight years of data exclusivity for biologics, the TPP has two other key patent protections. One requires countries to allow the practice known as “evergreening”—letting drug companies request patent extensions for new uses of old drugs. (Opponents of evergreening say it allows companies to extend their lucrative monopoly on drug sales for flimsy reasons.) The other provision makes it easier for drug makers to request extensions on their patents if it takes more than five years for an application to be granted or rejected.¶ “**I am sure it will increase the prices of medicine**,” Judit Rius Sanjuan, a legal adviser to Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF), tells Quartz. “It will take components of US law and export them to other countries, and create a new global norm that will change the way the TRIPS agreement was negotiated.”

**That kills millions and makes a disease pandemic inevitable**

Wiley-Blackwell 9 – citing Dr David Fedson, former Professor of Medicine at the University of Virginia School of Medicine and formerly Director of Medical Affairs, Aventis Pasteur MSD

("Vast Majority Won’t Have Access To Antivirals In Pandemic, But Generic Drugs Could Help Prevent Deaths." ScienceDaily. ScienceDaily, 15 June 2009. <www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2009/06/090612122451.htm>.)

Almost 90 per cent of the world’s population will not have timely access to affordable supplies of vaccines and antiviral agents in the current influenza pandemic, but it is possible that **inexpensive generic drugs** that are readily available, even in developing countries, could save **millions of lives**. ¶ That’s the conclusion reached by an extensive review and analysis by immunisation expert Dr David Fedson, published online by Influenza and Other Respiratory Viruses within hours of the World Health Organization declaring a pandemic.¶ Dr Fedson points out that seasonal flu resistance to antiviral drugs like Tamiflu may make them ineffective in the pandemic and maintains that without effective drugs some countries will have to rely on 19th century public health measures to see them through the outbreak.¶ He is calling for urgent and sharply focused research to determine whether drugs that reduce inflammation or modify the host response - the way that the body responds to infection or injury - could be used to manage the pandemic. And he believes that a lot could be learnt from the work done on these commonly available generic drugs - which include drugs to lower cholesterol and treat diabetes - by scientists not involved in influenza research.¶ “Despite the best efforts of influenza scientists, pharmaceutical companies and health officials, the stark reality is that although studies of the molecular characteristics of influenza viruses have been enormously informative, they have failed to explain the system-wide effects that flu has on people who contract it.¶ “For example we still don’t understand why so many young adults died in the 1918 pandemic, while the death rate for children was much lower. I believe this is because researchers have focused on studying the actual virus rather than how these particular hosts – the children and young people – responded to the virus. ¶ “Most of the world’s population lack realistic alternatives for confronting the next pandemic and urgent research is vital. Otherwise people everywhere might be faced with an unprecedented public health crisis.”

**Extinction – burnout is wrong**

Sandberg 8 - Oxford University Future of Humanity Institute research fellow

(Anders, PhD in computation neuroscience, and Milan Cirkovic, senior research associate at the Astronomical Observatory of Belgrade, "How can we reduce the risk of human extinction?" Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-9-2008, thebulletin.org/how-can-we-reduce-risk-human-extinction)

The risks from anthropogenic hazards appear at present larger than those from natural ones. Although great progress has been made in reducing the number of nuclear weapons in the world, humanity is still threatened by the possibility of a global thermonuclear war and a resulting nuclear winter. We may face even greater risks from emerging technologies. Advances in synthetic biology might make it possible to engineer pathogens capable of **extinction-level pandemics**. The knowledge, equipment, and materials needed to engineer pathogens are more accessible than those needed to build nuclear weapons. And unlike other weapons, pathogens are self-replicating, allowing a small arsenal to become exponentially destructive. Pathogens have been implicated in the extinctions of many wild species. Although most pandemics "fade out" by reducing the density of susceptible populations, pathogens with wide host ranges in multiple species can reach even isolated individuals. The intentional or unintentional release of engineered pathogens with high transmissibility, latency, and lethality might be capable of causing human extinction. While such an event seems unlikely today, the likelihood may increase as biotechnologies continue to improve at a rate rivaling Moore's Law.

**Ext—TPP ↑ Generic Drug Prices**

**TPP destroys access to generic drugs and there’s no link turn because it doesn’t boost innovation**

Barclay ‘15-- Journalist at Healthline Networks, Inc.

R. Sam, 6-12-15, Would the Trans-Pacific Partnership Boost Drug Prices and Endanger Access?, Healthline, http://www.healthline.com/health-news/would-the-trans-partnership-boost-drug-prices-and-endanger-access-061215#1

One in four people in the United States over the age of 45 takes statins to lower their cholesterol levels. The leader of the statin pack has been Lipitor, the top-selling drug in global history, which achieved nearly $14 billion in sales in 2006. To achieve such hefty profits, Pfizer sold the drug at costs that, for some, exceeded $3 a day. When Pfizer’s patent expired in 2011, new generic versions of the drug rushed to the market and the price fell to less than $1 a day.¶ The difference is even more dramatic for HIV medications. In 2001, brand-name HIV drugs cost $10,439 per person per year, compared to generics that cost just $350.¶ Currently, a patent lasts for 20 years, giving drug companies ample time to reap the rewards of their drug research. After a patent expires, other companies are free to manufacture the same drug. That lowers prices, making medications more affordable.¶ But the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) may change that system.¶ The U.S. House of Representatives vote today means Congress will have an opportunity to make changes to the agreement President Obama is negotiating, but there’s no guarantee that controversial patent protections in the agreement wouldn’t remain.¶ What Would TPP Do?¶ Currently, the United States and 160 other nations belong to the World Trade Organization (WTO), which oversees the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). Through TRIPS, all participating nations agree to honor these 20-year drug patents.¶ However, there are some exceptions. Under TRIPS, countries that lack the ability to manufacture drugs they need can get a compulsory license that essentially allows them to ignore another country’s patent and import patented, brand-name drugs at generic drug prices. In practice, this means developing countries can get access to new life-saving medications right away, rather than waiting two decades for the drugs to become affordable.¶ Although it has its flaws, this system has struck a balance between enabling drug companies to turn profits and helping people get the medicines they need to live.¶ Trade Pact¶ Under the TPP, corporations could take steps to bypass local laws in other countries if they are bad for business – for example, an American-owned industrial plant in Vietnam could refuse to respect a local law about dumping toxic waste if they could successfully argue that the costs of safe waste disposal would harm their profits.¶ The TPP, if ratified, would affect 12 countries around the Pacific Rim, including the United States.¶ In the case of pharmaceutical patents, the TPP appears to offer much stronger protections for drug companies than those set by TRIPS. Patents could be extended beyond 20 years, delaying the rate at which generics can come to market, for example. **Poor countries would also have reduced ability to get brand-name drugs at generic costs**. Medicare and other government programs around the world could also lose their bargaining power to get generic drugs at reasonable prices.¶ There are more provisions to beef up patents in ways that global health advocates fear will hurt patients. A wider range of drugs would be eligible for patents, including “me-too” drugs that don’t improve the effectiveness of existing drugs. Some surgical and diagnostic techniques could also be patented, meaning doctors could only use the methods if they paid the patent holder. Provisions that would protect data would also force drug manufacturers looking to introduce a generic drug to conduct their own safety and efficacy studies, which costs money and exposes patients to added risk.¶ “The TPP proposes to strengthen, lengthen, [and] broaden the pharmaceutical industry’s monopoly protections,” said Peter Maybarduk, director of the Global Access to Medicines Program at the U.S. good governance group Public Citizen. “That will limit generic competition and therefore access to affordable medicines for all the countries involved.”¶ These concerns were echoed by Doctors Without Borders in a letter to President Obama, warning “unless certain damaging provisions are removed, **the TPP has the potential to become the most harmful trade pact ever for access to medicines**.”¶ Long-Term Versus Short-Term Access to Drugs¶ The debate over the pharmaceutical provisions boils down to a conflict of perspective. Which is more important: getting existing drugs for treatable conditions to people who need them now, or researching new drugs to treat the many still incurable diseases?¶ The drug discovery process is incredibly expensive. It costs about $2.6 billion to bring a new drug to market, according to a Tufts University study. About a third of those expenses go to basic safety testing before the drug ever reaches humans. And 9 in 10 of the drugs that go through this testing fail in human trials.¶ For pharmaceutical research to make sense financially, there has to be a reasonable expectation that the few drugs that do prove useful will turn a handsome profit.¶ “The many provisions that affect pharmaceutical companies seek to encourage innovation and give companies that invest in research the certainty that investors need to continue their involvement in the process,” said Mark Grayson, vice president, communications and public affairs, of the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), in an interview with Healthline. “We believe this ... will ensure that consumers will have the medicines sooner to treat or cure many deadly diseases.”¶ Maybarduk takes a very different view of the pharmaceutical industry.¶ “All that money that they need to ‘be secure’ is money that comes out of our pockets,” he argued. “It certainly doesn’t make families more secure, people caring for sick relatives more secure. Medical illness and drug prices are the leading driver of personal bankruptcy in the United States. Internationally, drug prices lead to a considerable amount of suffering and death every year, because companies tend to find they make more money selling at high prices to the few than affordable prices to the many.”¶ Maybarduk also questions whether pharmaceutical companies are delivering on their promise to fund more research with their drug profits.¶ “They’re putting in maybe 12, maybe as much as 18 cents on the dollar in R&D. They spend more on marketing than they do on R&D,” he said.

#### TPP crushes biopharma

Lybecker 16

Kristina M. Lybecker is an associate professor of economics at the Colorado College. Her research analyzes the difficulties of strengthening intellectual property rights protection in developing countries, specifically in the context of the pharmaceutical and environmental technology industries. Her research also addresses alternatives to the existing patent system, the balance between pharmaceutical patent protection and access to essential medicines, and the markets for jointly produced goods such as blood and blood products. She has also worked with the US FDA, Reconnaissance International, PhRMA, the National Peace Foundation, the OECD, the Fraser Institute, and the World Bank, on issues of innovation, international trade, and corruption. Intellectual Property Protection for Biologics: Why the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Trade Agreement Fails to Deliver, msm

For many patients the new medicines in the development pipeline offer the hope of a treatment or cure. To date there are approximately 7,000 medicines globally in development for a wide variety of diseases. Of these, more than 5,000 are in development in the United States, pointing to the dominance of the United States biopharmaceutical industry (PhRMA, 2015). The numbers are revealing, if not shocking. Biopharmaceutical research and development is overwhelmingly focused in the U.S. because here it is incentivized and encouraged through a robust intellectual property rights protection environment. Across the board, the United States provides the most comprehensive intellectual property rights for biopharmaceuticals. As a result, the industry locates here, researches here and thrives here. It is difficult to argue that the strength and success of the U.S. biopharmaceutical industry is uncorrelated with the IP protection available here. With an acknowledgement of the importance of intellectual property rights as well as the wider benefits of biopharmaceutical research and development, it’s tremendously disappointing that the recently negotiated Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) Trade Agreement fails to deliver sufficient IP protection for biologics. The final sticking points, leading up to the final draft, largely focused on the provisions for data exclusivity for biologic medicines. Ultimately, the ratification of the TPP agreement may hinge on precisely this issue. Although Senator Orin G. Hatch (Utah) allied himself with President Obama to help conclude the trade negotiations among the 12 Pacific Rim nations, he has made it clear that the TPP falls short in its protection for biologic medicines, going so far as to call for a renegotiation of the agreement (Calmes, 2015). To start, it is critical to understand why this is an issue and what the debate consists of. Due to the great expense of bringing a new medicine to market, the intellectual property rights protection granted to innovators is disproportionally important for the biopharmaceutical industry to ensure that the researcher appropriates the returns to R&D.ii Protection is essential in these industries due to the extremely high costs of R&D that accompany many new drugs, as well as the competitive nature of the industry.iii That is, given the ease of replicating chemical and pharmaceutical innovations, intellectual property protection is vital for the economic profitability of these firms. Current estimates place the preapproval cost of developing a biologic at close to $1.2 billion and the time needed to recover these costs is between 12.9 and 16.2 years (DiMasi & Grabowski, 2007; Grabowski, Long & Mortimer, 2011). Acknowledging that these numbers are highly controversial, drug development is undeniably expensive and the process requires a significant investment of time, scientific talent, and money. Intellectual property rights protection incentivizes these investments, facilitating biopharmaceutical research and development. Biologic medicines are fundamentally different from traditional “small molecule” therapies, presenting a host of new challenges in the design and enforcement of the intellectual property (IP) architecture that will protect them.iv Protecting the intellectual property of biologics is complex, difficult, and essential to the future of medicine. The nuances of producing biologics greatly complicate the logistics of protecting their intellectual property, making patents alone inadequate for safeguarding their IP. In the context of the TPP, the crux of the debate over IP protection for biologics focuses on the provisions of data exclusivity protection. For the innovator, the period of data exclusivity provides a window of time, following marketing approval, during which competing firms are prohibited from using the innovative firm’s safety and efficacy data, from proprietary preclinical and clinical trial results, to secure marketing authorization for a biosimilar (generic) version of the drug. Proprietary data is generated from day one when the compound first shows medicinal promise – a process that is lengthy, time-consuming, and expensive. The firm’s investment in clinical trials and the collection of this data is thus protected for a fixed period, regardless of the length of time necessary to bring the drug to market. While patents and data exclusivity protection are complementary in incentivizing innovation, they function in different ways and serve distinct purposes. Patents protect innovations that meet the standards of patentability and are novel, nonobvious, and useful. In the context of biologics and the biopharmaceutical industry, patents protect both breakthrough discoveries as well as incremental improvements. Due to the length of the drug-development and patent-approval processes, effective patent terms rarely correspond to FDA approval. Accordingly, in some cases innovative therapies may experience patent expiry shortly after arriving on the market. In contrast to patents, data exclusivity protects the tremendous investments of time, talent, and financial resources required to establish a new therapy as safe and effective, protection that may extend beyond patent expiry. Data exclusivity is not an extension of patent rights, and it does not preclude a third party from introducing a generic version of the innovator’s therapy during the data exclusivity period, provided that the innovator’s data is not used to secure marketing approval. This is accomplished by requiring biosimilar firms applying for regulatory approval of the same or a similar product to independently generate the comprehensive preclinical and clinical trial data rather than rely on or use the innovator’s data to establish safety and efficacy of their competing product. Given the nontrivial cost of generating and collecting this data, the competing firm may instead wait a set period of time after which they are able to utilize the innovator’s prior approval in an abbreviated regulatory approval, eliminating the need for independently generated data. Fundamentally, data exclusivity protection incentivizes biopharmaceutical firms to invest the necessary time and financial resources in establishing the safety and efficacy of their product and prevents competitors from free riding on these efforts for a limited period of time. While data exclusivity protection provisions are included in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement, the length of this period of protection was a major source of disagreement during the negotiations and remains at the heart of Senator Hatch’s criticism of the final text. That is, how long are biosimilar firms required to wait before they are allowed to take the regulatory shortcut and use the innovator’s data to secure regulatory approval. Internationally the period of time varies significantly across countries, including across TPP signatories. In Europe, for marketing authorization applications made after November 2005, the period of data exclusivity has been harmonized at eight years from the date of first authorization. Australia, Singapore and South Korea provide five years of data exclusivity. Under U.S. law, the innovator’s data is granted 12 years of exclusivity. This period was vigorously debated and analyzed before being established. And yet, even this timeframe fails to provide the minimum (12.9 years) number of years needed to recover the development costs.v,vi,vii Under vivii the proposed TPP Agreement, innovators would only be granted five years of protection. Critics claim that this is a victory for the pharmaceutical industry, noting that Peru, Vietnam, Malaysia and Mexico who currently provide no data exclusivity for biologic medicines, will have to wait at least five years before allowing biosimilars onto the market. Notably these are not innovator countries, yet they fully enjoy the benefits of costly pharmaceutical innovation. Removing the incentives to innovate cannot be considered a victory by any stretch of the imagination. Given that data exclusivity provisions are at the heart of securing Congressional support for the Trans-Pacific Partnership, it is essential to understand why this protection is of utmost importance to the biopharmaceutical industry. First, it is worth noting that the complexity of clinical trials and the approval process has increased considerably, as shown in Table 1 above. As clinical trials increase in length and complexity for FDA approval, the medicine’s effective patent life is shortened. Biopharmaceutical firms seeking approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) will have examined 5,000 to 10,000 experimental compounds over a ten to fifteen year period, and ultimately typically only one will gain approval. Moreover, a mere three out of every ten pharmaceuticals developed will recover the financing required for their development, leaving those few blockbuster products to cover the expenses of numerous failures.viii All the while, the uniqueness of the innovation is threatened by the ease of their replication. Innovative biologic firms are significantly disadvantaged if biosimilar firms do not have to bear the research and development costs and are still able to bring a biosimilar (generic version) to market, compete and sell the drugs. This is further compounded by the significant and increasing cost of clinical trials, which are overwhelmingly borne by biopharmaceutical firms. Clinical trials now account for the largest portion of drug development costs. According to Adams and Brantner (2010), in 2010, the average costs of Phase I, II and II clinical trials were estimated to be $24 million, $86 million, and $61 million, respectively. More recently, a 2012 study calculates that on average 90 percent or more of a drug’s development costs are incurred in Phase III trials (Roy, 2012). In 2013 the biopharmaceutical industry sponsored 6,199 clinical trials of medicines in the United States, involving a total of 1.1 million participants (Battelle, 2015). Table 2, below, describes the breakdown of these trials, while Figure 1 provides the estimated average per-patient clinical trial costs, by phase. The lion’s share of the expense of lengthy clinical trials is borne by the biopharmaceutical industry. According to a recent study by researchers at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, the biopharmaceutical drug and medical device industry now funds six times more clinical trials than the federal government (Desmon, 2015). The study reports on both industry-sponsored trials and National Institutes of Health (NIH) funded trials between 2006 and 2014.ix The researchers find that the number of newly registered industry-sponsored trials grew by 43 percent in the intervening eight years, from 4,585 in 2006 to 6,550 in 2014, while the number of newly registered NIH-funded trials decreased 24 percent over the same period, from 1,376 in 2006 to 1,048 in 2014. The trend emerged as the budget for the National Institutes of Health suffered a 14 percent decrease since 2006 (Cohn, 2015). The numbers are indicative of an important trend. As described by Dr. Reshma Jagsi, the deputy chair of the Department of Radiation Oncology at the University of Michigan, the study confirms “a quiet but critical shift in the funding of clinical trial – the evidence upon which we base changes in medical practice” (Cohn, 2015). As such, it is critical that clinical trials deliver the information that best informs public health decisions. Not surprisingly, clinical trials funded by the biopharmaceutical industry frequently differ from those funded by government entities such as the NIH. Dr. Stephan Ehrhardt, the leader of the Johns Hopkins study, points out that while an industry-funded trial of a blood pressure drug might test that drug in comparison to a placebo, an NIHfunded study would investigate the drugs performance against other drugs or diet and exercise. In like manner, an industry-funded trial of a drug for tumors might analyze the drug’s ability to shrink a tumor, not its ability to extend a patient’s life or enhance the quality of that life (Cohn, 2015). The Johns Hopkins study highlights the significant role of the biopharmaceutical industry in funding clinical trials. Assuring innovators a return on their investments in drug development, including costly clinical trials, is essential to incentivizing this research and to the discovery of future treatments and cures. This points to the critical importance of data exclusivity protection, in the TPP Agreement and future trade agreements. The design of intellectual property rights protection shapes innovation. As such, the data exclusivity provisions in the TPP and all intellectual property policies that have the potential to stifle innovation should be viewed with skepticism and adopted with caution. In the context of healthcare and drug development, a recent study by Budish, Roin, and Williams (2015) provides important evidence on how IP policy decisions influence the direction of research and ultimately the biopharmaceutical medicines that are developed. The study shows that biopharmaceutical firms underinvest in long-term research on treatments for early-stage cancers due to the increased time and expense required to engage in such research, specifically lengthy clinical trials. Drugs for the treatment of late-stage cancers are less expensive to develop, in part because late-stage drugs extend patients’ lives for a shorter period of time such that clinical trials are concluded more quickly. Accordingly, drugs for latestage cancers require less time to research, develop, test and bring to market than those that treat earlier stage cancers, providing the innovator with a longer effective patent life. In essence, less research and development investment is directed toward drugs that treat patient groups requiring lengthy clinical trials, those with longer commercialization lags. Budish, Roin and Williams proxy the commercialization lag with a greater five-year survival rate which equates to a shorter effective patent life. Their results indicate that, for a given diagnosis, a ten percent increase in the five-year survival rate is correlated with an 8.7 percent reduction in R&D investment. The study includes over 200 subcategories of cancers, spanning a number of different stages of development. Utilizing data on clinical trials that use mortality vs. those that use “surrogate endpoints” (biomarkersx ) to establish effectiveness, in addition to a host of complementary evidence, the study suggests that the distortions in R&D investments, resulting from variations in effective patent lives, generates an underinvestment in long-term cancer research. Accordingly, existing R&D investments fall short, delivering fewer potential life-years saved as they might if research and development on early-stage cancers and cancer prevention were incentivized with longer effective patent lives. If society wants innovation on treatments and cures for all diseases – even those that are the most challenging to treat, we must ensure that this research is incentivized and that firms are able to capture the benefit of their successes. Simply put, the benefits of breakthrough biopharmaceutical innovation should be available to all, but the innovator should be rewarded as well. Under the TPP Agreement, the incentive to invest in the risky, expensive, time-consuming drug development process is reduced. Shortened periods of data exclusivity protection will undoubtedly hasten biosimilar competition and save money for the non-innovating nations, but it may cost us all a future of breakthrough therapies and cures. Technology inevitably evolves faster than the legal architecture that surrounds it. The provision of data exclusivity protections is a prudent legal step to catch up to the science that brings us biologic medicines. Biologic medicines are critical to the healthcare advances of the future, and data exclusivity is vital to innovative biologics. The period of data exclusivity provides innovators with an incentive to invest in generating and collecting the testing data necessary to prove a drug’s safety and efficacy. Data exclusivity grants innovators a measure of certainty that they will enjoy a fixed amount of time during which they maintain proprietary control of the test data that resulted in the approval of their drug before requiring that data be made available to biosimilar imitators. As technology evolves, making the development of new biologic vaccines and therapies possible, society’s commitment to incentivize innovation and protect it must be enshrined in the intellectual property protections of agreements such as the TPP.

**The link is systemic—plan causes millions of deaths**

Culbert ’15 -- president of Médecins Sans Frontières Canada

Heather, 7-17-15, date accessed: 6.26.16, Why the TPP trade deal is a threat to public health, The Globe and Mail, http://www.theglobeandmail.com/globe-debate/why-the-tpp-trade-deal-is-a-threat-to-public-health/article25548162/

In 2004, I travelled to the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the medical humanitarian organization Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders) as part of an exciting new program: We would be treating HIV-positive patients with life-saving antiretroviral medication. Affordable AIDS treatments had only recently become available, thanks to the hard work of a group of HIV patients and activists who had helped negotiate access to generic medicines for low-income countries such as Congo.¶ Generics were low-cost versions of the high-priced branded medicines that, thanks to efforts by pharmaceutical companies to protect their patents, had been inaccessible to many of the world’s poorest people. I saw my patients transformed: People who had been facing certain death now had a chance to live, to care for their families and to thrive. Today, more than 12 million people in developing countries are using HIV treatments, most of them dependent on affordable, generic versions of the medications they need.¶ Sadly, more than 10 years since I helped treat those patients, the right to manufacture and distribute generic antiretroviral medications seems to have been an isolated victory. The pharmaceutical industry has been working hard to ensure that generic versions of other life-saving medicines remain unavailable – subject to the full restrictions of international patent protection and therefore far less affordable. The list of inaccessible medicines resulting from these restrictions includes newer antiretroviral drugs, vaccines and treatments for tuberculosis and hepatitis C.¶ Since 2010, Canada has been in negotiations with the United States and 10 other Pacific Rim countries to finalize the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, a massive trade deal with potentially far-reaching implications. Although the contents of the TPP have not been made public, leaked documents suggest the deal will significantly increase the scope and duration of patent and other monopoly protections for medicines. These changes go well beyond the minimum requirements set by the World Trade Organization and create a new high-water mark for intellectual property rights – and another barrier to accessing affordable medicines for the world’s poor.¶ Do the intellectual property protections of patent-holders take precedence over the public-health needs of societies? As a physician, I am firmly rooted on the side of the patient. Canadian and U.S. governments have also shown themselves willing to overrule patent-holder rights when faced with serious public health threats, such as the anthrax scare in 2002 or the “swine flu” pandemic in 2009-2010. During the latter case, Ottawa was clear that protecting the health of Canadians was its primary responsibility.¶ In the developing countries where MSF does most of its work, the public health needs are often huge. Even some countries participating in the TPP negotiations, such as Peru and Vietnam, are places where many people still cannot afford the medicines they need. Under the TPP, not only would pharmaceutical patents be expanded and extended, but international trade disputes would be addressed by third-party tribunals that lack either transparency or an appeals mechanism. Many countries will feel they have no choice but to comply, even though most of their citizens will have no hope of accessing potentially life-saving medications.¶ But it is not just people in low-income countries who will be affected by the TPP. Canadians will also face extended patent provisions and increased costs for medications. Pharmaceutical companies don’t hesitate to protect their commercial interests, as demonstrated by a $500-million lawsuit by Eli Lilly against the Canadian government (and taxpayers) for the rejection of two drug patents and for allowing competitors to enter the market. The TPP would put even more of this type of leverage in the hands of pharmaceutical companies against the rights of governments.¶ The time to address these issues is now. On June 23, the U.S. Congress voted to authorize the government to fast-track the TPP negotiations. Trade ministers from all countries involved are now preparing for meetings at the end of July in Hawaii, and a final deal could be signed by year’s end. A number of organizations, including MSF, are concerned that without transparency or public consultation, the TPP will create damaging trade-agreement precedents that would further restrict access to life-saving medicines for millions of people.¶ Fortunately there are signs that some countries, including Canada, have reservations about the provisions on medical patents proposed by the United States and may be willing to push back. It is crucial that our government hears from Canadians concerned about the impact of the TPP.¶ Access to medicines cannot be reduced to simple economics. New trade deals that extend patent rights and promote abuses of the patent system ultimately have **major public-health consequences**. There is a life attached to every calculation of supply and demand for medicines: For every vaccine not given, and every antiretroviral that is too expensive, a real patient pays the price. Many of the world’s poor already lack access to life-saving medications. We cannot erect more barriers again.

**Jacks generic medicine prices**

Slegers 6-11-15 -- has conducted research at Monash University's Michael Kirby Centre for Public Health and Human Rights, and has recently published in Journal of Bioethical Inquiry and Medical Journal of Australia, PhD in sociology

Dr. Claudia, TPP deal heralds soaring cost of medicines, Independent Australia, https://independentaustralia.net/business/business-display/tpp-deal-heralds-soaring-cost-of-medicines,7815

The price of medicines is a key concern identified by a public health review of the TPP, conducted by the Centre for Health Equity Training Research and Evaluation at the University of NSW and other Australian universities.¶ According to the review, the TPP’s proposed intellectual property guidelines are likely to lengthen monopolies over new medicines by allowing pharmaceutical companies to lock up their clinical trials data from cheaper generic manufacturers for longer, and delay access to generics. Escalating costs to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) would force consumers to pay higher co-payments and reduce access to expensive new treatments.¶ Under existing arrangements, Australia already provides 5 years of data protection. In the current trade negotiations, the U.S. is seeking at least 3 extra years of data protection for new uses of existing drugs and 12 years for so called biologic drugs and vaccines (that is, drugs and vaccines derived from biological, DNA containing, material, rather than chemicals).¶ A handy example of the costs of delaying market entry of competitors for biologics is a medicine called adalimumab (Humira), a drug for rheumatoid arthritis. This drug cost Australian taxpayers $272.7 million in 2013-2014, representing the third-highest cost to government via the PBS. When the first generic or biosimilar version is listed on the PBS, it will trigger a 16 per cent statutory price reduction on all versions of the product.¶ This means savings to tax payers of $43.6 million in the first year (based on 2013-14 expenditure data), and with flow-on effects resulting from price disclosure likely to lead to further savings in subsequent years, according to public health expert Dr Deborah Gleeson.¶ TPP provisions will also further entrench a pharmaceutical industry practice known as “evergreening” that extends monopoly periods for medicines. Secondary patents are patents of extremely low ingenuity based on an original inventive patent for a new molecule. Evergreening patents are secondary patents held by the owner of the original patent.¶ The practice has been shown to delay generic competition for 19 years and beyond the date from which generic entry would have been anticipated, according to a U.S. study cited by Gleeson. Evergreening consumes large chunks of the PBS budget, preventing other new drugs being listed. It is particular problem in countries such as Australia and the U.S. that have low patentability standards.

### 1ar – disease MPX

#### solves disease

Agrawal 15

Prashansa Agrawal, Department of Chemistry, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, Biopharmaceuticals: An emerging trend in Drug Development, SOJ Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences, http://www.symbiosisonlinepublishing.com/pharmacy-pharmaceuticalsciences/pharmacy-pharmaceuticalsciences20.pdf, msm

In the last two decades, the field of new drug development has moved its focus from small-molecule compounds to large-molecule proteins and other biopharmaceuticals. These biopharmaceuticals have caused an archetype shift in disease cure and has led to an enhancement in the quality of life of patients with various diseases such as autoimmune diseases, refractory cancers. In 1982, first biopharmaceutical product was approved by USFDA and since then the number has been increasing rapidly [1]. The recombinant protein therapeutic, Humulin, was introduced as biopharmaceutical in 1982. This was followed by therapeutic monoclonal antibody like Proleukin, and Zenapax (humanized monoclonal antibody) in 1990s. In 2003, Phage-evolved antibody, Humira was introduced by Egea Biosciences Inc. At present, there has been a rapid advancement in the number of biopharmaceuticals available for clinical use. The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) has approved 18 new biopharmaceutical products in 2012, which include eight recombinant proteins, along with two monoclonal antibodies and one engineered antibody-like biomolecule, covering a wide range of innovation, novelty, healthcare and market impact [1]. Research data released by PharmaVision in 2009 [2] shows that biopharmaceuticals represent 7.5% of all drugs in the market and account for ~10% of the total expenses for marketed drugs. The usage of biopharmaceuticals are increasing at the rate >20% per year. They are already being used74% more than chemicallyderived pharmaceuticals, in life-saving or end-stage applications [2]. Moreover, biopharmaceuticals covers > 30% of all pipeline research programs going-on at present [2]. Biopharmaceuticals are defined in various different ways based on the opinion from different sources. In broad biotechnology term, biopharmaceuticals are defined as pharmaceuticals inherently biological in nature, extracted or manufactured by biotechnological methods, generally containing live entities or their active components [3]. This broad view has been implemented in United States and European Markets, which embraces all recombinant proteins, monoclonal antibodies, cytokines, peptides, vaccines, blood/plasma-derived products, non-recombinant culture-derived proteins, nucleic acid-based products (DNA, RNA or antisense oligonucleotides used for curative or in vivo diagnostic purposes), cells and tissues cultures. This view is possibly best understood by the public and mostly used by the people in the biopharmaceutical industry within the United States of America [4].

**Ext—generics solves disease**

**Cheap generic drugs stop disease spread and pandemics—HIV/AIDs prove—solves millions of deaths independently**

Ruxin 10 -- PhD an Assistant Clinical Professor of Public Health at Columbia University’s Mailman School of Public Health and the founder and director of the Access Project

Josh, 11/11, AIDS Drugs – For Profit Or Not?, Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/sciencebiz/2010/11/11/aids-drugs-%E2%80%93-for-profit-or-not/

Today a year of HIV/AIDS medication costs less than $100. **Generic drug companies largely drove this change.** By some estimates, generics account for more than 90% of the market for AIDS medications. How exactly did this happen? It was a complex brew of developments that included overcoming patent barriers to produce and sell the drugs in developing countries. Branded companies played a role by issuing more and more voluntary licenses and by refraining from seeking patents in many low-income countries. Meanwhile, makers of generics developed more efficient manufacturing processes and negotiated bulk discounts on raw materials. This progress rapidly helped to shift the old paradigm of low volume/high prices to a new one of high volume/low prices. **If this shift hadn’t happened, millions would have died**, and drug companies – both branded and generic – would have profited much less. It was a classic example of doing well by doing good.

**Warming**

**2ac TPP bad – climate change**

#### TPP causes runaway climate change and devastates the environment

Lilliston ’15

(Ben, Yes Magazine, 11/12/15, date accessed: 6.26.16, “3 Ways the TPP Will Hurt the Climate—If We Let It Pass,” http://www.yesmagazine.org/new-economy/3-ways-the-tpp-will-hurt-the-climate-if-we-let-it-pass-20151112)//AP

President Obama announced his decision last week to reject approval for the Keystone XL pipeline, which would have brought fuel from the[Canadian tar sands](http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/tar-sands-and-keystone-xl-pipeline-impact-on-global-warming/) through the heartland of the U.S. to the Gulf of Mexico. Because this oil emits more greenhouse gases than other forms of fuel, the decision had everything to do with climate change and came just a month prior to the United Nations climate talks in Paris.

“America is now a global leader when it comes to taking serious action to fight climate change,” [Obama stated](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/11/06/statement-president-keystone-xl-pipeline). “And frankly, approving this project would have undercut that global leadership.”

Fortunately, the TPP is far from a done deal.

While environmental groups hailed the Keystone announcement, they have criticized the Administration’s push for a massive new trade agreement called the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) as a big step backward on climate. In fact, the proposed agreement, [finally made public last week](https://ustr.gov/trade-agreements/free-trade-agreements/trans-pacific-partnership/tpp-full-text), is literally in climate denial: nowhere in its 5,000-plus pages do the words “climate change” appear.

In many ways, the TPP is a broad [attack on](http://www.yesmagazine.org/new-economy/trade-rule-illegal-favor-local-business-tpp-leak-wikileaks) locally based economies that protect the climate and support renewable energy. Instead, the agreement tilts the playing field in favor of multinational corporations and financial institutions. Fortunately, it’s far from a done deal.

The TPP is considered the largest free trade agreement ever negotiated, with the countries involved contributing 40 percent of global GDP. It includes the U.S. and 11 other Pacific Rim countries: Mexico, Canada, Peru, Chile, Japan, Vietnam, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei.

The TPP expands trade by lowering tariffs, which are taxes on imported products like food, shoes, or fuel. But it goes much further than that. It sets a common system of regulations and rules for corporations operating in TPP countries—all designed to accelerate trade. With 30 chapters, the TPP sets rules for things like patents for medicines (and plants), how governments can purchase goods and services, and how the financial sector and food safety can be regulated. It also establishes an independent legal structure to enforce these rules.

While the TPP doesn’t mention climate change explicitly, many of its provisions would have important implications for the climate, aside from the simple fact that [expanded trade increases greenhouse gas emissions](https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/booksp_e/trade_climate_change_e.pdf) related to transportation.

Here are a few of the big concerns with the TPP:

1. It expands the rights of corporations to challenge regulations.

The TPP establishes special legal rights of foreign corporations to challenge new regulations that it views could impact future profits. These corporate rights, first established under NAFTA in 1994, would be granted to corporations in all TPP countries. As an example, TransCanada is currently considering whether to bring a [NAFTA challenge](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/259611-keystone-xl-not-dead-yet) over President Obama’s rejection of the Keystone pipeline. Other corporate rights cases challenging fracking bans and the rights of oil companies to drill offshore point to how regulations that mitigate climate change could be challenged under the TPP.

2. It drives natural gas exports and production.

The TPP mandates the automatic approval of Liquified Natural Gas (LNG) export permits to TPP countries, a policy the Sierra Club says is likely to lead to an [increase in fracking](https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/uploads-wysiwig/TPP-LNG_Factsheet_Updated.pdf). Japan is already the world’s largest importer of natural gas, and anticipates importing much more if the TPP is approved. Fracking has not only been linked to air and water pollution; the process is a high emitter of greenhouse gases, and it further locks in a fossil-fuel based system of energy over renewable options.

3. Limiting support for local, renewable energy systems.

The U.S. Trade Representative is the government agency that represents the United States in trade negotiations. One of its priorities in the TPP has been to eliminate what it calls “[localization barriers to trade](https://ustr.gov/trade-topics/localization-barriers),” which means striking down government programs that give preference to local or national businesses. But this is not just for other countries—the same rules would apply here in the United States. A recent trade tribunal at the World Trade Organization gives an example of what this looks like in practice: The tribunal ruled against [an Ontario policy](http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/industry-news/energy-and-resources/ontario-to-change-green-energy-law-after-wto-ruling/article12236781/)designed to create local green jobs through locally sourced renewable energy.

### 2ac TPP bad – WTO shift trick

#### shift from WTO to TPP wrecks efforts to combat warming

Ciuriak and Ciuriak 16

Natassia Ciuriak is an associate with Ciuriak Consulting Inc. She holds a Master’s degree in Public Policy and Administration from Carleton University and a Bachelor’s in Political Science from McGill University.Dan Ciuriak is Director and Principal, Ciuriak Consulting Inc. (Ottawa), Research Fellow with the CD Howe Institute (Toronto), and Associate with BKP Development Research & Consulting GmbH (Munich). Previously, he was Deputy Chief Economist at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) with responsibility for economic analysis in support of trade negotiations and trade litigation, and contributing editor of DFAIT’s Trade Policy Research series. Climate Change and the Trading System: Implications of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, 2-9-16, http://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=301002120071065114073124066096100105032027023067011038006025011072078076068031111101021018111115103010043004028089099117099090098074087007053117100115002107004073091026021066068124022093070081070014009096003025029030069018016119090093006014085117069089&EXT=pdf, msm

Abstract: This paper considers the implications of the shift of trade rule-making and liberalization from the World Trade Organization (WTO) to the mega-regional mode for the development of responses to climate change. We review developments at the interface between the trade system and climate change responses at the national, sub-national, corporate, and civil society levels, and evaluate the impact of the environmental provisions in the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement. We find that the shift of the main action in trade negotiations into the mega-regional forums is not a positive development for action on climate change. Effective action will be multilateral in scope, collective in nature, and policy-activist in design. From the perspective of interaction with trade rules, the coordinated industrial policies required to deliver a sustainable economy will likely require sanction under a multilateral environmental agreement. Armed with such an agreement, the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism could safeguard policy space while settling disputes. The mega-regionals will generate a system unfriendly to climate change policy, as they are plurilateral and exclusionary in scope, competitive in nature, and policy-restrictive in design. Moreover, they are leading in the development of investment and competition regimes that the WTO lacks. These latter regimes, which are increasingly important due to the high degree of trade and investment integration in the modern global economy, will be given teeth by investor-state dispute settlement mechanisms within the agreements. This militates against the evolution of a coherent and transparent body of climatepolicy-friendly case law, which would be more likely under a WTO regime. Perhaps most importantly, as the weak outcome of the TPP shows, they are likely to use up trade negotiating coin without contributing to climate change responses.

**1ar TPP bad – climate change**

#### tpp causes warming

Ciuriak and Ciuriak 16

Natassia Ciuriak is an associate with Ciuriak Consulting Inc. She holds a Master’s degree in Public Policy and Administration from Carleton University and a Bachelor’s in Political Science from McGill University.Dan Ciuriak is Director and Principal, Ciuriak Consulting Inc. (Ottawa), Research Fellow with the CD Howe Institute (Toronto), and Associate with BKP Development Research & Consulting GmbH (Munich). Previously, he was Deputy Chief Economist at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) with responsibility for economic analysis in support of trade negotiations and trade litigation, and contributing editor of DFAIT’s Trade Policy Research series. Climate Change and the Trading System: Implications of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, 2-9-16, http://poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=301002120071065114073124066096100105032027023067011038006025011072078076068031111101021018111115103010043004028089099117099090098074087007053117100115002107004073091026021066068124022093070081070014009096003025029030069018016119090093006014085117069089&EXT=pdf, msm

3 Discussion and Conclusions The main take-away point from the TPP’s environment chapter, perhaps, is that it could not even bring itself to mention climate change. This was held hostage to the special interests of the main economic powers in the negotiating group. The weakness of the language is telling – institutions have to be capable of prioritizing challenges and the TPP, considered as an institution, clearly did not rise to the occasion: the avowedly most important trade agreement of its era could not tackle the most pressing challenge facing its membership – indeed, it abstained from any serious comment – and was conspicuously absent even in indirect flanking measures (e.g., the TPP’s silence on such issues as illegal logging in TPP member states). Also glaring in terms of omission is any mention of ocean acidification, a far more serious source of marine environment damage than that from shipping and one directly related to climate change. Overall, the TPP does not stand up well to scrutiny as an instrument of public policy. This failure is all the more remarkable given the context in which the TPP negotiations were carried forward, namely the proliferation of extreme weather events which afflicted the major TPP parties, such as California’s ongoing super drought, 5 the floods in Colorado (2013) and in Texas and South Carolina (2015), which had previously been suffering from longer-term droughts, and the February 2014 record-breaking snowstorm that hit parts of Japan. 6 This can only be described as “blinkered” and a reflection of the consultative framework established for the negotiations. Even considered in terms of what the TPP did address, it is not evident that the TPP has added additional muscle to any environmental objective. The objectives of the chapter do not permit measurement (“promote”, “enhance”, and “recognize importance of”); the general commitments also do not permit assessment (“strive to ensure”); there are no minimum standards (“The Parties recognise the sovereign right of each Party to establish its own levels of domestic environmental protection and its own environmental priorities”, Article 20.3.2); and extra-territorial enforcement is not ensured. Only a failure to enforce environmental laws that affects trade and investment is subject to the strong “shall not” requirement (Article 20.3.4) – and, even then, parties retain discretion regarding “(a) investigatory, prosecutorial, regulatory and compliance matters; and (b) the allocation of environmental enforcement resources with respect to other environmental laws determined to have higher priorities”, and are understood to be in compliance with the “shall not fail” requirement on enforcement of their own laws, if this can be read as being within that discretion. There is a similar “shall not” requirement with respect to derogations from environmental laws in order to “encourage” trade and investment between the parties. In the limited treatment that is given to climate change, the TPP declined to commit to collective action and rather sought to reinforce voluntarism, even though it acknowledged that collective action was required to reduce emissions. Creative ideas, such as the suggestion to use a Montreal Protocol-type approach to emissions reduction, were passed over.7 Nor did the TPP address, in any constructive way, the trade frictions that have arisen between countries vying for dominant positions in key new technologies, such as solar and bio-fuels. While the guns have fallen relatively silent on this front in recent months, there is no positive policy to create industrial policy space for promotion of non-carbon-polluting energy, which deals with the problem of free riding that the WTO decision on local content requirements in the Canada-FIT case reinforced (Ciuriak and Ciuriak 2013). Another area where the TPP is missing in action is that it does not address the obvious tension between tightening intellectual property (IP) protection, which raises the price of advanced climate mitigation products, and the need for rapid deployment, particularly in the more rapidly growing developing countries, which could leap-frog dirty technologies and proceed to the latest and cleanest technologies. Given the gravity of climate change, the thought arises that consideration might well be given to a special IP regime for climate change mitigation, analogous to the regime for HIV drugs under the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) Agreement. Given that the TPP has been most heavily criticized for its IP measures (including indirectly by the 17 Nobel Laureate economists who condemned the extension of copyright to 70 years in the United States and who presumably would not change their opinion on this measure in its TPP incarnation; see Akerlof et al. 2002), a gesture in this direction would have been at least good public relations, as well as partly offsetting the negatives of its IP policies. The TPP’s claim to establishing a new generation of governance is undermined by its inability to balance public policy issues: simply put, the TPP is commercial horse-trading with public policy airs, but little public policy substance. Such balance as there is comes from the incorporation by reference of WTO exceptions. This is hardly a ringing endorsement for what the TPP itself brings to the table and gives pause to considering the cost of not having expended the negotiating coin in Geneva. The remaining mega-regionals on the tables (TTIP, RCEP, and TiSA) are unlikely to succeed where the TPP has failed, as the problem lies in the mode. Effective climate action will be multilateral in scope, collective in nature, and policy-activist in design, with the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism safeguarding multilaterally-agreed policy space in its decisions. The mega-regionals, exemplified by the TPP, will generate a system unfriendly to climate change policy, as they are plurilateral and exclusionary in scope, competitive in nature, and policyrestrictive in design. Moreover, they are leading in the development of investment and competition regimes, which the WTO lacks. These regimes, which are increasingly important due to the high degree of trade and investment integration in the modern global economy, will be given teeth by the mega-regionals’ ISDS mechanisms. This militates against the evolution of a coherent and transparent body of climate-policy-friendly case law, which would be more likely under a WTO regime.

**TPP tubes the environment and accelerates warming**

Brune ’15 -- executive director of the Sierra Club.

Michael, 10/7/15 Congress Should Oppose TPP on Environmental Grounds, The New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2015/10/06/the-future-of-trans-pacific-trade/congress-should-oppose-tpp-on-environmental-grounds

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would be an environmental disaster. The pact’s environment chapter outlining conservation rules, praised by the U.S. Trade Representative, cannot make up for the deal’s threats to our air, water and climate. That's why dozens of environmental organizations, like the Sierra Club, continue to wave red flags.¶ Among our many concerns is the investor-state dispute settlement system included in the pact which would empower some of the world’s biggest polluters to challenge environmental protections in private trade tribunals. Similar rules in existing pacts have enabled corporations like ExxonMobil and Chevron to bring more than 600 investor-state cases against more than 100 governments. The TPP would expand this system of corporate privilege to thousands of corporations, including major polluters like BHP Billiton. The TPP would also require the Department of Energy to automatically approve all exports of natural gas to countries in the agreement, including Japan, the world’s biggest natural gas importer. **Expediting those exports could open the floodgates to more fracking and dangerous climate emissions**.¶ There’s little reason to believe that the rules in the environment chapter that deal with challenges such as illegal timber and wildlife trade would lead to meaningful changes on the ground. The U.S. is not known for holding other countries accountable in failing to live up to environmental commitments made in trade pacts. The U.S. has a pact with Peru, for instance, aimed at stopping illegal timber trade between the two countries. Yet illegal logging and associated trade are still rampant, and no one has been held accountable for violating the deal. That’s not the model of trade we want to replicate.¶ The TPP would harm our environment, jeopardize the health of our families and set us back instead of tackling the climate crisis head on. Congress should oppose this toxic deal.

**Insures a rapid increase in GHG emissions**

Vincent 14 -- J.D., University of San Diego School of Law,

David P., Article: The Trans-Pacific Partnership: Environmental Savior or Regulatory Carte Blanche?, Winter, 2014, Minnesota Journal of International Law, 23 Minn. J. Int'l L. 1

While any increase in trade and production has potential environmental impacts, the TPP would particularly affect several specific environmental areas due to the current state of socioeconomic affairs of its potential members. One such area, anthropogenic climate change, is a widely recognized global problem. 196 According to the International Energy Agency, trends indicate that "delaying action is a false economy" and that the opportunity cost of preventative action today is less than twenty percent of what would be required after 2020. 197ANovember 2012 World Bank report predicts that the world [\*30] temperature will increase by as much as four degrees Celsius by 2100 if GHGs continue to rise at current rates. 198 This past century has already seen a 0.8 degrees Celsius increase, and while governments have vowed to make efforts to limit the increase to only two degrees Celsius, the authors of the report do not believe the proposed global efforts, if enacted, will be effective enough to meet their goal. 199 A broad consensus exists for the proposition that a global mean temperature increase greater than two degrees Celsius will result in increasingly costly adaptation and considerable impacts that exceed the adaptive capacity of many systems and an increasing and unacceptably high risk of large-scale irreversible effects. 200¶ NAFTA's members 201, Mexico, Canada, and the United States, represent some of the worst offenders for GHG emissions. The three North American countries are among the top fifteen countries in terms of GHG emissions; in 2009, the United States alone accounted for 18.9 percent of the world's emissions. 202 From 1990 to 2005, GHG emissions increased at an alarming rate, with increases of 17, 26, and 37 percent in the United States, Canada, and Mexico, respectively. 203 While emissions from Asian countries, excluding China and India, are not nearly as large as North American countries, their emerging economies are expected to produce a very large increase in GHGs over the next few decades. 204¶ [\*31] Climate change is an environmental concern of the TPP because of the increases in GHGs resulting from trade liberalization. FTAs usually result in the increase of exports, which requires increases in production and transportation. According to one study, trade liberalization leads to an expected increase in exports of 3.36 percent per year, which coincides with an increase of 3.4 percent in transport emissions and 4.3 percent in output related emissions per year. 205 **Numerous econometric studies have found similarly large positive correlations between instances of trade liberalizing and GHG emissions**. 206 Considering that the TPP covers members that are separated by the Pacific Ocean, the increase in transport related emissions could be especially significant as 33 percent of trade-related emissions come from international transport. 207¶ Many countries have shown their commitment to reducing GHGs through international agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol. 208 As a trade agreement without any offsetting GHG provisions will negatively contribute to the increasingly dire climate situation, countries that are concerned about the environment will want to take into consideration the inevitable effects that the TPP will have on climate change.